DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 068 UD 014 417

TITLE	Report to the Governor on Discrimination Against Asians.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Commission on Asian-American Affairs, Olympia.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 73
NOTE	124p.; Public Hearing Conducted on March 3, 1973, Seattle, Washington
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Asian Americans; Bias; Broadcast Television; *Chinese Americans; Employment Opportunities; *Filipino Americans; Institutional Personnel; *Japanese Americans; *Korean Americans; Local Government; Race Relations; *Racial Discrimination; Racism; Social Discrimination; Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS	Washington

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to stimulate discussion, promote understanding, develop better awareness, and thereby bring about action to make necessary changes toward racial equality and justice. The public hearing conducted on March 3, 1973 by the Washington State Asian American Advisory Council brought attention to the fact that racism has and still does exist against Asians. The hearing and this report addressed itself to the issue of racism, whether individual or institutional, overt or subtle, intended or unintended, and how its resultant effects have excluded and subordinated Asians in ways unique only to Asians as well as in other ways similar to other minorities. Testimony was heard from Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean. Their experiences and observations indicate the depth of racism and its permeating effect on Asians. Being made to feel inferior; subjected to ridicule; rejecting one's own identity; feeling helpless, enraged, frustrated are no strangers to Asians. Survival often meant being quiet, but to exist under such conditions is to deny one's own dignity. Limited research to the extent of providing adequate background to understand the import of the testimonies given was necessary to present this report in its proper perspective. Recommendations for remedial action made by the Hearing Committee follow each testimony. (Author/JM)

ED 094068

DANIEL J. EVANS
GOVERNOR

REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR
ON
DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ASIANS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

PUBLIC HEARING CONDUCTED ON MARCH 3, 1973
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON
ASIAN-AMERICAN ADVISORY COUNCIL

JUNE 30, 1973

UD 014 417

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction 1
The Chinese (Karen C. Wong). 2
The Japanese (Minoru Masuda) 6
The Filipinos (Frederic A. Cordova). 10
The Koreans (Hae Soung Kim). 14

THE TESTIMONIES

Introduction 19

Communications

Television (Barbara Tanabe). 20
Asian Stereotypes (Maxine Chan, Denise Louie). 29

Construction

Contractors and Unions (Jim Takisaki). 34
Driver's License (Mrs. Y. D. Ho) 41

Employment

Firefighters (Randall Foy) 42
Physicians (Dr. Archimedes Garcia, Dr. Manuel Ramos, Dr. Vilma Naguit, Dr. Charu Mati Rao, Dorothy Cordova) 46
Postal Service (Masao Tomita). 53
Alaskan Salmon Canneries (Nemesio Domingo) 57
University of Washington (Michael Castillano). 63
Colleges and Public Schools (Cesar DeGracia, Paula Frial). 69
Industry (Ricardo Farinas) 71
General (Lisa Mocorro, Dina Valentine) 74

Page

Housing (Vic Bacho) 75
Law Enforcement (Larry Flores) 79
Military Experience (Tom Mizuta) 83
Public Assistance (Gregory Tsang) 89
Religion (Tsuguo Ikeda) 97
Social Clubs (Andres Tangalin) 105

SUMMARY 113

FOREWORD

Against a backdrop of growing Asian Awareness within the state of Washington, a group of concerned Asians met to discuss ways in which their awareness of institutional racism against Asians and their commitment to bring about corrective changes could be put into effective action. This was not the first time such a group of Asian activists had met to talk about common problems within their respective communities. Many were not strangers to the struggle for human rights. Nor was this the first time that Asians from the four major ethnic groups (Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean) collaborated in a common effort to bring about changes which would benefit all Asians in the state of Washington. What was unique about these series of meetings was the resultant action taken.

These community discussions led to a meeting with Governor Evans and his staff in Olympia. The Asian community pressed for the creation of an Asian American Advisory Council, and Governor Evans responded by creating such a body to advise him on "matters pertaining to the needs of Asians in the state of Washington." The Council's formation has significance not only for Asians in this State but can serve as a model of action for Asians in other states.

The creation of the Council signaled the beginning of an opportunity for Asians to impact on society at the highest level of State Government. Whereas, prior to the creation of the Council, Asians were left to voice their grievances within a small arena or to smother them in fatalistic resignation, the Council provides an avenue for Asians to act on their grievances by holding elected officials and public agencies accountable for the insensitivity of government to the needs of Asians. In the short time of its existence, the Council has already demonstrated its ability to bring about changes in public agencies which have benefited the community.

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of the Council members and staff in bringing to fruition the Public Hearing herein reported. A special acknowledgement is made to Mr. Philip Hayasaka who chaired the Hearing Committee, and whose prolific mind spawned the idea and nurtured it through hard work to its conclusion.

Joseph T. Okimoto, M.D.
Chairman

Council Members:

Rick Ancheta - Auburn
Cheryl Chow - Seattle
Frederic Cordova - Seattle
Lois Fleming - Seattle
Frank Fujii - Seattle
Frank Hattori - Seattle
Philip Hayasaka - Seattle
Don Kazama - Seattle
Rev. Hae Soung Kim - Seattle
Joan Kis - Seattle
Richard Lee - Yakima
Joseph T. Okimoto, M.D. - Seattle
Fred Pagaduan - Bremerton
Robert Santos - Seattle
Mayumi Tsutakawa - Seattle
James Watanabe, M.D. - Spokane
Ben Woo - Seattle
Rev. Robert Yamashita - Tacoma
Isabella Yen, Ph.D. - Seattle
Maxine Chan - Seattle

Staff:

Martin Matsudaira - Executive Director
Nam Chu Pearl - Administrative Secretary

PREFACE

While racism affects all minorities, much attention has been addressed, and deservedly so, to its effects against Blacks. Too often, however, the plight of the other minorities goes unheard and unheeded.

The public hearing conducted on March 3, 1973 by the Washington State Asian American Advisory Council brought attention to the fact that racism has and still does exist against Asians. The hearing and this report addressed itself to the issue of racism, whether individual or institutional, overt or subtle, intended or unintended, and how its resultant effects have excluded and subordinated Asians in ways unique only to Asians as well as in other ways similar to other minorities.

The purpose of this report is to stimulate discussion, promote understanding, develop better awareness and thereby bring about action to make necessary changes toward racial equality and justice.

Testimony was heard from Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and Korean. Their experiences and observations indicate the depth of racism and its permeating effect upon Asians. Their testimonies shattered the myth that Asians had no problems, and that Asians were well accepted.

Being recipients of stereotyping, name calling, exclusion, subordination is not unfamiliar to Asians. Being made to feel inferior; subjected to ridicule; rejecting one's own identity; feeling helpless, enraged, frustrated are no strangers to Asians. Survival often meant being quiet, but to exist under such conditions is to deny one's own dignity.

Limited research to the extent of providing adequate background to understand the import of the testimonies given was necessary to present this report in its proper perspective. Recommendations for remedial action made by the Hearing Committee follow each testimony.

This hearing was the first of its kind in these United States. Such a hearing does not just happen, without many people devoting much hours, energy and efforts to make it a success. Special appreciation deservedly goes to Committee members Maxine Chan, Pio DeCano, Lois Fleming, Frank Fujii, Don Kazama, Rev. Hae Soung Kim, Munfert Lee, Dr. Joseph Okimoto, Bob Santos, Mayumi Tsutakawa, and Dr. Isabella Yen. Staff assistance was provided by Council Director Martin Matsudaira.

The coordination and edition of testimonies, conducting necessary research and the writing of the report became the responsibility of Dr. Minoru Masuda and Research Assistant Diane Wong, with the aid of Fred Cordova, Rev. Hae Soung Kim, and Karen Wong. Acknowledgement is made to Frank Fujii for design and art work. Their participation in developing this final product is truly appreciated.

Philip Hayasaka
Chairman, Hearing Committee

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

No Statue of Liberty with torch held high faced west across the Pacific to welcome the "tired," the "poor," and the "huddled masses" of Asia as it did those of Europe. It symbolizes an attitude that has darkened the history of the Asian immigrant whenever and from wherever he came. And they came, from the mid-19th century on, a trickle compared to the waves of Europeans. They came as laborers, birds-of-passage, as students, as entrepreneurs, as farmers, as craftsmen, as professionals - all came with the high hope of a dream of America as a land of opportunity and democracy. But these dreams were soon to be dashed against the hard rocks of reality and the slowly yielding, oft-violent racism against people of color.

The hard experiences of the Asian immigrant were those of all immigrants, separated by language, culture, and customs, but compounded by racial factors. The problems of survival in a strange and hostile land were monumental and many were to leave in defeat or to escape into the urban ghetto.

In the burgeoning West, the Asians were a substantial force in its growth and development - in railroading, in mining, in lumbering, in fishing, in farming, and in the cities. To them the challenge of America was a call to their best. They were to survive, adapt, and even flourish.

The early 20th century American ideal of the melting pot where peoples and cultures are homogenized and cast into a single American mold has failed. Instead has arisen the concept of cultural pluralism which recognizes the equality of all ethnic groups and cultural diversities as an enrichment of American society of which they are an integral part.

The sections in this chapter tell the separate and distinctive histories of the four major Asian groups with which this report is concerned - the Chinese, the Japanese, the Filipinos, and the Korean. Each is uniquely placed in the context of time and history, in the culture from which they came, in their role in the developing West and in their American experience. But through each runs the common thread of prejudice and discrimination against Asians. The earlier immigrants' tragic experiences are now visited upon succeeding generations in more subtle and covert forms of institutional racism. Latent prejudice and unflattering stereotypes still abound even as they flared anew in 1942 when the Japanese were herded into concentration camps. This report deals with some of these current, economic, social, legal, and political discriminations.

THE CHINESE

Karen C. Wong

The history of discrimination against Chinese is very unique, for though the Chinese people contributed so much toward the building and greatness of America, they were singled out as both a people and as a nation to be discriminated against by national legislation designed to stop the Chinese from coming to this country.

The story begins when the first great influx of Chinese came to this country in 1843, as coolie labor to work in the mines during California's gold rush. They were originally received with an attitude of special tolerance and sympathy. However, that disappeared quickly when the Chinese began to appear in the mines in 1851. They were attacked vigorously and viciously by both public laws and popular uprisings. From 1850-1870, California enacted the Foreign Miners Tax enforced exclusively against every Chinese, which resulted in 50% of total revenues paid as taxes during the first four years of this enactment and 98% of total revenues during the final 16 years. As early as 1849, in a Chinese camp in California, an uprising took place against 60 Chinese miners. At Marysville, California, white miners in 1852 drew up a resolution asserting that "no Chinaman was to be henceforth allowed to hold any mining claim in the neighborhood." These anti-Chinese sentiments spread throughout California and in every mining town, there were similar restrictions and uprisings. Discrimination developed against them because of peculiarities of dress, to their color, language, inoffensive habits and their willingness to work for lower wages. The Chinese were driven out of the mines about the same time as the railroads were being built.

Because of scarcity of labor, the Chinese were recruited to work on the Central Pacific in 1865. Because of their efficiency, coolies were soon transported from China to work on the railroads. The Civil War period marked a decline in anti-Chinese sentiment for their labor was needed to complete the Central Pacific railroad.

The demand for Chinese labor decreased in the '70's, and the Chinese entered many different occupations from laundering, tailoring, fishing, to cigar making. At this time, a flood of European immigrants of the laboring class arrived in California. They organized, mainly to secure better treatment for themselves, and it was not until then that the Chinese became undesirable elements.

The anti-Chinese movement reached its peak in 1875 when the Bank of California failed and California went through one of its worst economic setbacks. At this time the Chinese immigrant problem was confined mainly to California and the San Francisco region. With the finish of the transcontinental railroad and California depression, a trickle of immigrants came to the Pacific Northwest, the Rocky Mountain states and the Eastern Seaboard.

In 1885, here in the Northwest, hundreds of Chinese were driven from Tacoma and their homes and businesses burned. In February, 1886, hundreds of white workers began coming to Seattle to drive out the entire Chinese population of 300-400 inhabitants. On February 7, the mob went from building to building in the Chinese section, loaded all the belongings of the Chinese, and marched them down to the docks. Money was raised by subscription to ship out 196 Chinese on the "Queen of the Pacific." The rest were marched home, and later took the train out until only fifteen remained. Governor Squires intervened, the rights of the Chinese were upheld, and martial law declared. President Cleveland sent Federal troops to back up Governor Squire's proclamation. The Chinese were allowed to return after the Great Fire of 1889, though a few had returned earlier and were prospering.

State legislation against the Chinese was started as early as 1852 when the governor of California advised that coolie immigration be restricted and in 1855 the state legislature enacted a law imposing a head tax of $55 on every Chinese. In 1858 a law was passed forbidding the Chinese from entering the state but such legislation was declared unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court and in 1876 by the United States Supreme Court. San Francisco also passed numerous city ordinances against the Chinese during this period like the Laundry, Queue, and Cubic Air Ordinances.

California's efforts to stop Chinese immigration were rendered futile by the Federal court decision, so California appealed to Congress for national legislation to stop Chinese immigration. When the country lapsed into a depression, anti-Chinese feeling entered into national politics and in 1876 both parties inserted an anti-Chinese plank in their platforms to secure the votes of the western states.

In 1880 a law was passed whereby the United States could regulate, limit, or suspend but not prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to this country. On May 6, 1882 a law was passed suspending Chinese immigration for ten years. This was the first national restrictive legislation on immigration and established the permanent exclusion of the Chinese. Congress continued all laws in force, so absolute prohibition of Chinese laborers continued. It accomplished the effective exclusion of Chinese laborers for Chinese immigration dropped to zero. This was the first time that the American government had ever stopped people of a specific origin from coming to the United States. No Chinese citizen could be legally admitted to the United States as an immigrant from 1882 to 1944 when the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed.

By the end of the 19th century, the California Chinese had, for the most part, died off, returned to China, moved eastward, or settled into those ghettos of American cities referred to as "Chinatown." Chinatown was the only place a lonely Chinese laborer found fellowship, companions, social familiarity, and solace. Chinatown acted as a buffer against the prejudices, hatreds, and depredations of hostile whites. Chinatown originated with a parental sense of group feelings and social needs and, at the same time, white aversion and hostility gave added reasons for these Chinese institutions to continue to flourish. Chinatown was usually a small area, consisting of three or four city blocks near the center of a large city. Here Chinese formed their own organizations which took care of their own community's needs. In those days Chinatown was wide open, businesses flourished, and some Chinese became very wealthy.

Unsavory elements also existed here in the form of gambling and opium dens, singsong girls and tong wars. This was primarily due to the lack of opportunity for family living - an effect of the exclusion acts which resulted in subtle genocide of the Chinese. Between the period of 1850-1882 with unrestricted immigration, a total of only 8,848 Chinese women journeyed to America. In the same time span, over 100,000 Chinese men arrived in the United States. In 1890 there were left only 3,868 Chinese women. Before the turn of the century, there were about 27 Chinese men for every Chinese woman. A closer balance of the sexes did not occur until the 1960's.

As family building began, problems like tong wars and opium smoking began to disappear. These changes produced a new person, a Chinese American. He automatically became a citizen through birth in this country. Although proud of his Chinese heritage, he identified more with America. Yet before the Second World War, University graduates of Chinese descent could not obtain jobs outside of Chinatown. The war changed this and helped the Chinese perhaps more than any other nationality. Due to the lack of manpower during the war, the Chinese began to enter fields closed to them previously.

The successful struggle of a few Chinese to assimilate into America's society cannot be seen as representative. Imbedded institutionalized racism affects and discriminates against many less fortunate Chinese Americans. Prevailing attitudes and stereotypes of Chinese have often resulted in low promotional jobs and positions and limited participation in the mainstream of American life. We see ignorant and apathetical attitudes toward the social problems of the Chinese and the exclusion in education of historical contributions the Chinese have made in America.

The Chinese must be recognized as a people who have long endured discrimination in trying to assimilate into the American society. Society must eliminate its discrimination and subordinating practices because the profound reality is that the Chinese will not deny their Chineseness as something to discard along the path toward Americanization. America must accommodate this if she is truly to be a democratic nation.

References

1. Chu, Daniel and Samuel, Passage to the Golden Gate. Doubleday and Co., N.Y., 1967.

2. Garis, Roy, Immigration Restriction. McMillan Co., N.Y., 1927.

3. Lyman, Stanford M., The Structure of Chinese Society in Nineteenth Century America. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1961.

4. McKenzie, Roderick, Oriental Exclusion. University of Chicago Press, 1928.

5. Mears, Eliot Grinnell, Resident Orientals on the Pacific Coast. University of Chicago Press, 1928.

6. Stephenson, George, A History of American Immigration. Ginn and Co., Boston, 1926.

7. Sung, Betty Lee, The Story of Chinese in America. Collier Books, N.Y., 1967.

8. Wu, Cheng-Tsu, "Chink!" World Publishing, N.Y., 1972.

THE JAPANESE

Minoru Masuda

In 1853, Commodore Perry steamed his black ships into Tokyo Bay to force open Japan's door to the outside world. It was the beginning of turbulent times which culminated in the downfall of the Tokugawa shogunate and the rise of the Meiji era in 1868. This marked the end of feudalism and the beginning of the westernization process, a century of struggles and conflicts, and the entrance of Japan into the world of nations.

At the start, Japan strongly resisted the call from Hawaii and America for cheap labor. In 1886 she capitulated to foreign demands as well as her own internal problems to allow labor emigration. The immigrants came first to the plantations of Hawaii in a trickle and thence further to California's shores. From 1890 on, the numbers of immigrants began to rise. In 1890, there were 2039; by 1910, there were 72,157. They were young, they were male, and they were a spirited lot. They came from around the Inland Sea and the southermost island of Kyushu. They came as birds-of-passage, as students, as farmers, as laborers, as craftsmen, as merchants, as professionals, and as tradesmen - all eager to mine the American streets of gold.

The demand for cheap labor followed the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. Discriminatory acts were to fall on the incoming Japanese as it had fallen on the Chinese. The U.S. Industrial Commission Report of 1900 characterized the Japanese thusly: "They are more servile than the Chinese, but less obedient and far less desirable. They have most of the vices of the Chinese, with none of their virtues. They underbid the Chinese in everything and are, as a class, tricky, unreliable, and dishonest." Other worse epithets were cast upon the Japanese as labor felt infringed upon, especially in San Francisco, where the immigrants clustered. Unions harassed shoemakers, restaurants, and small businesses with demonstrations, boycotts, and violence.

The combination of working man and politician was joined by the politically ambitious publisher of the San Francisco Chronicle, who, in 1905 began a series of articles which inflamed the public with sensational headlines such as, "Japanese, a Menace to American Women," "Brown Men, An Evil in the Public Schools," and "Crime and Poverty Go Hand in Hand with Asiatic Labor." The victory of Japan over Russia in the Battle of Tsushima Straits led to further anti-Japanese agitation against immigration. In 1906, the San Francisco Board of Education again issued an order segregating the Japanese school children. The rationale for this was simple: the Japanese are ineligible for citizenship because they are unassimilable; therefore, they must be inferior and unfit to associate with white children. This insult to the Japanese was protested to the City, the Consul-General and thence to the Japanese government. International furor followed and the intervention of President Theodore Roosevelt resulted in a rescinding of the order, but at the price of the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907 by which Japan voluntarily closed off the flow of laborers to the United States.

Thence began the family building period as immigrants sent for picture brides from Japan or themselves went back to claim a bride. In the cities, on the farms, in the forests, and on the seas, the Japanese became prime hands in the development of the west's natural resources. On the farm, especially, was their industry felt. They were to convert the arid land, the rocky soil, the muddy swamp, the stumped ground to fertile production. As the Japanese reclaimed the unwanted land, made it produce, and increased their acreage, the alarmed Californians passed the Alien Land Law in 1913 which prevented the aliens from further purchase of land and confining leases to three years. The obvious loophole of assigning ownership to children citizens was closed by the 1920 Alien Land Law. Similar laws were passed in almost all the western states. In these states, the acreage farmed by the Japanese was a very small fraction of the total state cropland.

Hidden in the 1920 Alien Land Law controversy was the deeper issue of the Japanese ineligibility for citizenship and a thrust for Japanese exclusion. The Exclusion League redoubled its efforts and this powerful coalition of "patriots," politicians, war veterans, labor, farms and granges, and fraternal organizations was to strike a blow for white supremacy by successfully securing passage of the law which excluded Japanese immigration in 1924. The testimony of a California delegate to the Senate hearings left no doubt of the racist intent:

> "The Supreme Court of the United States...divided the people of the world into two great groups...all the Caucasians on one side ...on the other side...all of the races of color other than white.... It is utterly impossible to accept the black race or the brown race or the yellow race.... This domain belongs to the people of the United States, belongs to the white race now and forever."

The echoes of these racist sentiments were to be heard again 18 years later, in 1942, with the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor. The reawakening of the stereotype, the rise of inflammatory pressure groups, fear, hysteria, and economic and political greed, were of sufficient reason to invoke the idea of military necessity and over 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were deprived of their constitutional rights and liberty by being evacuated from the West Coast and herded into concentration camps in the hinterland. A sampling of the remarks of the powerful gives an indication of the strength of anti-Japanese feelings:

> Senator Tom Stewart (Tennessee): "The Japanese are among our worst enemies. They are cowardly and immoral.... A Jap is a Jap anywhere you find him and his taking the oath of allegiance to this country would not help. They do not believe in God and have no respect for the oath."

> Columnist Walter Lippman: "Nobody's constitutional rights include the right to reside and do business on a battlefield."

> California Attorney General Earl Warren: "There is more potential danger among the group of Japanese who are born in this country than from the alien Japanese."

> Western Defense Commander, General George DeWitt: "...racial affinities are not severed by migration. The Japanese race is an enemy race, and while many second- and third-generation Japanese are born on United States soil, possessed of United States citizenship, have become 'Americanized,' the racial strains are undiluted. It therefore follows that along the Pacific Coast over 112,000 potential enemies of Japanese extraction are at large today."

When in 1945, detention in camps was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, the unwanted Japanese were to return slowly to the Coast, but many were to remain relocated in other parts of the country. From 1950 to 1965, claims were made by the evacuees to the Federal government for losses sustained in the move. The total amount paid out for these claims were 38 million dollars; the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco estimate of these losses were 400 million - a recompense of less than an inflated 10 cents on the dollar. If one totals up the evacuees' loss of property and income, the costs of evacuation and detention, the costs of adjudication, the loss of manpower during the war-shortage years, it was a billion-dollar tragedy of America's "worst wartime mistake."

In 1945, the Supreme Court in the Korematsu case was to decide that the evacuation of the Japanese was constitutional. Justice Black in the majority report said, "We cannot reject as unfounded the judgment of the military authorities and of Congress that there were disloyal members of that population whose number and strength could not be precisely and quickly ascertained." There had not been a single case of espionage or sabotage by the resident Japanese on the West Coast or Hawaii.

Justice Murphy in his dissent was to say, "Such exclusion goes over the very brink of constitutional power and falls into the ugly abyss of racism.... Individuals must not be left impoverished under constitutional rights on a plea of military necessity that has neither substance nor support." Justice Jackson left this pertinent warning, "...once a judicial opinion rationalizes such an (military) order to show that it conforms to the Constitution...the court for all time has validated the principle of racial discrimination in criminal procedure and of transplanting American citizens. The principle then lies about like a loaded weapon ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need." That loaded weapon still lies about in 1973.

It is clear that a new mythology is being created. The new mythology of the Japanese American as a "model minority" who has made it, is now so prevalent that they are no longer seen as being discriminated against. The myth carries with it a double advantage to white America of a conscience-cleansing tolerance to minority assimilation which allows a continuation of the status quo. Extolling the virtues of the Japanese Americans proclaims, in the same breath, the goodness of American society in the process. To be pointed out as an ethnic group that has "pulled itself up by the bootstraps," as a model for emulation by other minorities is to cast an onus upon the others and to alienate the Japanese Americans. Inter-ethnic conflicts now surfacing in California attest to the effectiveness of the alienation. Discrimination against Japanese Americans is now played out on a different battleground; it is more subtle and insidious. If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, then, the Japanese Americans must be even more vigilant now. The continuing fight for equality is far from over.

References

1. Daniels, R., *The Politics of Prejudice*. Antheneum, N.Y., 1970.

2. Daniels, R., *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

3. Girdner, A. and Loftis, A., *The Great Betrayal*. McMillan Co., London, 1969.

4. Hosokawa, B., *Nisei, The Quiet Americans*. Wm. Borrow and Co., N.Y., 1969.

5. TenBroek, J., Barnhart, E. N., and Matson, F. W., *Prejudice, War, and the Constitution*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1954 (Third Printing, 1968).

6. Thomas, D. S. and Nishimoto, R. S., *The Spoilage*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969.

THE FILIPINOS

Frederic A. Cordova

What great designs did the Lord God of Our Fathers have in mind for Filipinos in America?

That Filipino Americans be ever patient, obedient, docile, passive? That they be naturally deprived and oppressed?

That they be programmed to supply cheap labor, grovel in agricultural fields, toil in canneries, sweat in kitchens, wash dishes, mow lawns, mop floors, pick up everybody else's dirt, supplement entry levels, provide token affirmative action statistics?

That they populate ghettos, fill jail cells, forego legal rights, shun political power, perpetuate Manifest Destiny?

That they lose their ethnic identification by playing villain roles as Oriental, Indian and Chicano "bad guys," seeing advancement solely for other ethnic groups, achieving mediocrity solely for themselves, and realizing nothing more than hand-me-down second-class citizenship privileges?

That they bear arms, fall on battlefields or kill other Asians?

That Filipinos expect always to answer to "boy" with a quaint accent, eternal acceptance, and a perennial smile?

That Filipino elderly be consigned to cockroaches' paradise and Filipino young be schooled in addicts' hallucinations?

That the Filipinos' money-less economic base, low-profile professional practice, deep-hidden vocational-technical employment, high-mortality school drop-outs, non-existing business community be equated to the other predominant Asian populations with needed services thus divided equally or on a quota system?

That the Filipino Americans' brown identity crisis take on a newer salvation plan, yellow rather than white or black processings?

That the Filipino Americans are to hope and in their forebearance eventually to despair, to love and in their generosity to be hated, to live and in their survival ultimately to die still unknown, unsung, unheralded, unaided among a minority within a minority within a minority?

By that God, hell no!

But that is what the majority establishment would have most white Americans, plus black, red, yellow and even brown, believe by continued overt and covert acts of discrimination and exclusion ever since 1898 when America first intruded among Filipinos and their revolution for national self-determination.

Seven long decades have transpired for the Great American Experiment and Filipinos are still guinea pigs, caged in institutional racism, and down at the bottom of the Asian totem pole. Free people Filipinos are not economically, educationally, politically, socially.

Filipinos began to emigrate in trickles to the United States at the turn of the century. Like all other Asian immigrants before them, males came first for economic and educational reasons.

At a time the Filipino population was less than 1000, a hitherto court case in Los Angeles, involving a Filipino allegedly accused of killing two white thieves, was play-acted in 1916. The English-limited-speaking defendant was not provided legal counsel. Asians then had no legal rights. The trial produced only circumstantial evidence, yet the conviction was to see the Filipino languish in prisons for 56 years.

In 1967 - 51 years later - a 17-year-old Filipino was to see his court case in the County of King, State of Washington, be remanded from juvenile to Superior Court after a stabbing incident that took the life of a 21-year-old white adult, whose body yielded a post-mortem blood alcohol test reading of .270 - enough evidence to show an advanced state of intoxication present at the time of death. This Filipino pleaded self-defense but because of a technicality in state law, "res gestae," was convicted, minus a "reasonable doubt," to a sentence of "not more than 35 years." He is still in prison despite the medical testimony and the aggressive action and known intoxication of the deceased.

Take the case of David McMahon, 18, in a supposed shoot-out with a Seattle police officer on the morning of February 25, 1973. It was presumed, thanks to the news barrage on television and daily newspapers for the next four days, that the police officer had been killed by the Filipino American youth, who is still presumed, but not fully substantiated, of firing first. The police officer, it was later found, died of gunshot wounds, inflicted by other policemen.

In a little over six years six court actions involving the question of Filipino intermarriage were filed in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The first, a criminal action in 1925, raised the question of intermarriage as a collateral issue, thereby providing reasonable ground for doubting not only the decision on intermarriage but the criminal verdict. A Filipino, thus, was convicted of murdering his white wife's paramour, also a white, on the wife's own testimony. The Filipino was imputed to have the "homicidal mania" of Malays, called "running amuck." The defendant's marriage was judged non-existent because California's Section 60 of the Civil Code had provided: "All marriages of white persons with Negroes, Mongolians or Mulattoes are illegal and void." Malays are Mongolians, according to interpretation.

This interpretation was overruled in 1931 with a court decision, stating that Filipinos are not Mongolians. An amendment in California statutes followed in 1933 to include Malays among those who could not contract marriage with white women. That new law was intended to include Filipinos without a doubt.

The State of Washington of all Far West states did not have anti-miscegenation laws to be repealed elsewhere only after World War II. But like its sister states, Washington was to exemplify much of the same patterns of overt and covert acts of discrimination towards Filipinos.

From 1924 with the passage of the U.S. "national origins" quota system to 1934 with the federal legislation of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth, Filipinos were to immigrate not as foreign aliens or American citizens but as nationals to the West Coast with Seattle a principal port of entry. Although the American flag was still to fly as the governing colonial power for 12 more years, Filipinos after 1934 were limited to 50 admissions per year and to be classified as aliens.

The immigration waves have increased since 1965 with the new immigration laws - first by sea and now by air to the U.S. with 3,140 in 1965 to a high of 31,203 in 1970. Those are just permanent residents. Filipinos are second to Mexicans in the highest numbers of immigrants and second to none in the highest number of professionals. In Seattle, these immigrants incur unemployment, underemployment, lack of communication skills and responsibilities of the late family. Some 90 per cent of present Seattle "Pinoy" (an in-ethnic term and very acceptable) immigrants are still Philippine citizens. Some are survivors of the White River Valley and Yakima riots. Yet the bulk of the "Filipino Movement" must fall on the shoulders of Filipino Americans, already active in the "Asian Movement," while searching for their own self-identity and brown emergence. The going is tough.

In Washington State there are no Filipino American (in this context native-born American) doctors, either M.D. or Ph.D., no lawyers, priests, elected state/county/city politicians, university/college deans or academic department heads - past or present, principals, or for that matter appraisers, bankers, builders, bus drivers, butchers, engravers, florists, garbagemen, jewelers, linotypists, locksmiths, milkmen, morticians, pilots, plumbers, radio announcers, realtors, stationers, television repairmen (let alone newscasters or announcers), truckers, upholsterers, zoologists nor dealers in boats, cars, fuel, furnaces, hardware, lumber, rugs, stoves, tires, or even possibly coveted Philippine cigars.

Are Filipino Americans that lazy and stupid they have not achieved? Or are equal opportunities in society's institutions not fully extended to them?

The answer to the first question is: Not the way the Lord God of Our Fathers designed Filipino Americans!

Washington State's Americans in organs of power will have to answer the second.

References

1. Buaken, Iris B., "The Commonweal," March 16, 1945.

2. Bulosan, Carlos, "America Is in The Heart," Harcourt, Brace and World, 1943-46, 326 pp.

3. Cordova, Fred, "Filipino Americans Join the Social Revolution," Seattle Times Magazine, January 7, 1973, and "The Burdens of Filipino Americans," Seattle Times Magazine, January 14, 1973.

4. Foster, Nellis, "Soc. and Soc. Research," v. XVI, May-June 1932.

THE KOREANS

Hae Soung Kim

I. The Rise of Immigration, 1903-1945

Korean immigration to America started with the beginning of the 20th century. There is no record of immigration from Korea until 1903, when the first group of 93 contract laborers arrived at the sugar plantations in Hawaii as free laborers. Their numbers were quickly increased as more laborers arrived in Hawaii; and by the end of 1904, 6647 Koreans had been admitted to Hawaii; and in 1905 the total number of the Korean laborers reached about 11,000.

In its earliest phase, the immigration from Korea was composed entirely of unaccompanied males. At first they had no intention of deserting Korea permanently, so they left their families behind. Thus they entered the United States not as permanent settlers but as transients.

The beginning of the Korean immigration to America was partly induced by the Hawaiian plantation contractors, who came to the port of Inchon in 1902, in order to import cheap labor. Although the immigrants were drawn from a variety of social classes, most of them came from the farmer stock from Pyong-An and Hwanghae provinces in Northwest Korea. They were largely unskilled male laborers who were distressed by drought in Pyung-An province. They were chiefly attracted by the prospect of earning some money, so they flocked almost exclusively to the sugar plantations in Hawaii.

These laborers were paid about 70 cents for a ten-hour day in the fields. It was impossible for these laborers to accumulate enough money to return to Korea. For better wages some left Hawaii for San Francisco where American railway companies recruited Korean and Japanese workers, and by 1907 as many as 2000 Koreans had arrived in San Francisco. Although wages on the mainland were somewhat higher than in Hawaii - from $1.20 to $1.50 per day - life was still difficult for them. Like Chinese and Japanese laborers the Korean immigrants represented an imagined menace to white labor. From 1900 on organized labor waged a systematic campaign against Asians which led, in 1905, to the formation of the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League. In addition to this, the Russo-Japanese War of 1905 produced in California a frenzied fear of the "Yellow Peril," and in 1907 immigration from Hawaii to the mainland was completely halted.

After the Russo-Japanese War, Korea became a protectorate of Japan. Because of the political unrest in Korea, Koreans who had emigrated abandoned the hope of returning to Korea and began to settle down. They turned to farming, and because the Los Angeles area provided more jobs for farm workers, by 1910, the center of Korean activities had shifted from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Throughout the West Coast, the Korean immigrants dispersed in the towns like Denver, Gresham, Portland, Salt Lake City, and Butte; and gradually they were joined by "picture brides." Towns like

Dinuba and Reedly in California and Gresham, Oregon have still flourishing Korean farms to this day.

The next wave of immigration took the form of an exodus, and consisted largely of students and intellectuals. Fighting against Japanese control over Korea, they came to America as exiles and provided leadership for the Korean Independence Movement. Between 1910 and 1919, about 300 Koreans came to America as students. Since they carried no passports they were admitted to the United States by a special order of President Wilson. These students settled in New York, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and college towns throughout the East and Midwest, where they were actively involved in the Korean Independence Movement.

Life was difficult for these intellectuals. Most of them worked part or full time as farm hands, factory workers, cooks, or at other manual labors. Hardly any could get into proper professional occupations because of prevailing racism. First, racist attitudes and social conditions prevented Koreans from assimilating into white culture. For example, Homer Lea, the leading publicist of the Yellow Peril, warned that America's racial purity was being threatened by Asiatic immigration. This was but one expression of prevailing sentiments.

Next, the Koreans themselves resisted the trend toward assimilation. They had preserved their cohesion and cultural distinctiveness almost intact. This is shown by the degree to which the Korean communities in America were involved in the Korean Independence Movement. Korean community leaders cultivated national pride and emphasized the distinctiveness of Koreans from Chinese and especially Japanese. In 1915, the Korean Christians broke with the Methodist Church in Hawaii over the issue of cultural amalgamation. Thus, before 1945, Korean society in America was characterized by its small numbers and intense isolation.

II. The Growth of Immigration, 1946-1960

In the next decades, the Korean community in America was changed drastically by the great influx of immigrants. In this period Korean immigration to America increased rapidly each year partly due to adverse conditions in Korea and also because American legislation allowed groups such as war brides, refugees, and orphans to enter.

In the wake of the Korean conflict, thousands of children were abandoned or orphaned by the death or disappearance of their parents. The war also resulted in numerous war brides and homeless refugees. The three provisions of the law, the "War Brides Act" of December 28, 1945, the orphan legislation that was first passed in 1948, and the Refugee Relief Acts of July 29, 1953 and September 11, 1957 facilitated the admission of these immigrants. Between 1946 and 1960, 4430 Korean refugees entered the United States, and through social work organizations such as the Holt Orphanage, thousands of Korean children came to America for adoption by U.S. citizens.

Moreover, the war brides and their relatives comprised the major bulk of the immigrants from Korea in this period. These war brides were dispersed around army bases all over the United States; they are now heavily concentrated in the cities like Tacoma, Fort Lewis, Washington, Denver, Colorado, and Monterey, California. The general dislike of foreigners was still working against Korean war brides who came to America and was compounded by a language barrier. In addition, many of the women were illiterate and unskilled. For many of them the marriages did not work out; they were abused and deserted, and they did not know where to turn for help.

III. The Beginning of Mass Immigration, 1960-1972

The period between 1960 and 1972 was characterized by an extraordinary increase in Korean immigration to America. The high standard of American civilization and its seeming inexhaustibility of economic opportunities captured the public imagination in Korea. "America, the earthly paradise" was but one expression of a sentiment that pervaded discussion at every level. There was no precedent for a movement of such magnitude and persistence as that which began about 1960.

While the relatives of U.S. citizens and permanent residents were steadily flowing into the United States, a greater number of students and visitors entered the country as non-immigrants. These people were generally drawn from the upper-middle class of Korean society. The Korean government did not allow any student to go abroad until he had finished his undergraduate training. During this period, Korean immigration continued its upward trend with 70,462 immigrants admitted to the United States; but the figure of the non-immigrants climbed to still greater heights. The comparative progress of immigrants and non-immigrants could be followed in the immigration statistics:

Year	Immigrants Admitted	Non-Immigrants
1960	1,507	1,504
1962	1,538	2,112
1964	2,362	4,068
1966	2,492	5,076
1968	3,811	9,309
1970	9,314	13,171
1972	18,876	23,473

The increase of temporary visitors in this decade is striking. In 1960, the number of visitors' arrivals was only 338; but 1972 brought more than twenty-fold increase to 8,323. In assessing the impact of this great wave of non-immigrants, one should bear in mind the strict immigration quota system, which was amended by the Act of October 3, 1965. The annual quota of 100 allowed to the Korean immigrants before 1965 was not enough to meet the demand of the Korean mass immigration. With great fervor, Koreans came into the United States under any pretext, and waited for a chance to change their status. Visitors and students were predominant of all the Korean aliens whose status was changed to permanent residence. The immigration statistics for the last five years shows a continual increase of students and visitors adjusting their status:

Year	Total Adjusted	Students	Visitors
1968	1,095	650	386
1969	1,812	1,015	622
1970	2,078	1,087	830
1971	3,838	1,184	1,915
1972	4,238	1,252	2,419

Of the Korean students who came to study in America, those who were either in medical or science fields had easy access to adjusting their visa status. Many were hired by hospitals, industrial firms, and engineering companies. The students quickly adjusted and settled down all over the United States. Yet the number of people who were in professional occupations remained very small, and competition for jobs was intense. Moreover, the Korean professionals were usually underpaid - a typical job for the Korean medical doctor was either intern or resident, or research assistant, earning from $100 to $150 per month plus room and board in 1960.

But still the tidal wave of brain drainage from Korea kept continuing for this decade, in spite of the efforts of the Korean government to halt it.

Besides professional occupations, the Korean immigrants started small businesses, such as restaurants, grocery stores, gift shops, or gas stations with whatever capital they had brought from Korea. In the last five years major cities such as Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, have substantial numbers of Koreans. Seattle has a small Korean residential and business area.

Many of the social functions and services to the Korean communities in America are being performed by Korean Christian churches of various denominations, with about 150 churches all over the U.S.A. Worship services are conducted in the Korean language.

Thus, being a minority ethnic group that has tried to keep its identity, the Korean community in America has much the same experience and discriminatory problems as other Asians in America.

Bibliography

1. Jones, M. A., American Immigration. Chicago, 1960.

2. Kim, Warren Y., Chae Mi Hanin Oshimnyon Sa (Fifty-Year History of Koreans in America). Reedley, 1959.

3. No, Chae-Yon, Chae Mi Hanin Saryak (A Short History of Koreans in America). Los Angeles, 1951.

4. Shin, Linda, "Koreans in America," in Roots: An American Reader, Eddie Wong, Franklin Odo, eds., Los Angeles, 1971.

5. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Annual Report, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1946-1972.

6. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. United States Immigration Laws.

THE TESTIMONIES

INTRODUCTION

History of the past leads into the present and casts a shadow for the future. The historical background, by giving perspective in time, makes more understandable, but no less endurable, the ongoing discrimination which continues to plague Asian peoples today.

The Asian experience says that racial prejudice and discrimination know no time boundaries. The form, the character, and the intensity may have changed, but to confine discrimination against yellow and brown people only to the past is to create another injustice of ignorance of the plight of many Asians and Asian Americans today. The same inequitable practices and victimization by racial prejudice is not a phenomenon only of years gone by, but is still a very much alive part of the present.

But, Asians are no longer to be denied a voice in the shaping of their lives. There is a ferment in the community, a clamor to be heard that the Asian people cannot and will not remain passive to the actions of American society which push aside their human rights. Their voices demand the attainment of the ideal of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The following eloquent testimonies given by Asians and Asian Americans are but a sample of a rising chorus. They testify to personal experiences that give substance to the discrimination extant today. The testimonies do not, by any means, encompass the full range of racially biased experiences, but rather they are offered as a representation of the kinds of discrimination that Asians have undergone in their daily lives for survival and well being. The testimonies are telling blows in the Asian fight for human dignity and equality.

TELEVISION

Barbara Tanabe

I've been working with KOMO-TV since 1970 and my official title is general news assignment reporter. However, I am also a hostess on a morning show between 8:30 and 9:30 daily, and within that show I am responsible for a five-minute news feature. That is my major duty every day to fill that spot.

I graduated from the University of Washington in March of '71 - my major was in communications in the broadcast sequence. However, before I graduated, I went out looking for a job. I was told by my instructor that there would be a black reporter leaving KOMO and they would need another black reporter to replace her - a female. They needed a minority person by FCC regulations. I made an application for the job; I did qualify as a minority member and I was a female. However, they did tell me that they preferred someone with experience so I would be working on a temporary apprenticeship and would graduate to a full reporter when they felt I was ready. When I was hired they asked, "Did it bother you that you are being hired because you are a minority?" and I said, "No," because I needed the job and I didn't care why they hired me. I knew that I could be a good reporter. When you are in the business you've got to remember that you are a journalist first.

But, since I was hired primarily because I was a minority person I felt a certain responsibility. For instance, if you watch the news show, every day, every hour, you will see lilly-white society giving you statements, giving you press releases - very seldom do you see any minority covering, unless it's a riot or it's a minority event. I really wanted to do the stories that would show how minorities really are. We do have our own culture; so I did quite a few stories dealing with minorities - the coverage of the Japanese girls getting ready for the Bon Odori festival, or the International District when the domed stadium was going to be built.

The big project that I undertook was one on the Japanese internment called The Fence at Minidoka. I worked on that six months in my spare time because I was not released from my general assignment. However, I undertook that documentary with the full support of management. I told them that it has been 30 years since the internment and I think it is time to go back and talk about what the Japanese Americans went through. When we think about Pearl Harbor, the way that news covers it is that they go and take a picture of a mother or a widow placing a wreath on a grave. That's fine, but that's not the whole story. Let's look at the people who went through it. And they said, "OK, go ahead and do a half hour."

So I talked to a white cameraman who agreed to work with me on it. We worked during the nights and weekends, and even got a chance to go down to Idaho to the remains of the camp. I came back and put everything together; I wrote the script, and I let the news director read it. He objected to just a few points where he said it was too strong, or where it was editorial judgment, and asked me to change those. But I did not change those because I felt they belonged there. One of them had to do with my statement that I thought it was one of the blackest periods in American history. That statement had been said by historians, government officials, students, everyone, and so I left it in. Another point dealt with the fact that the Japanese Americans were considered too dangerous to be left free but when the Idaho farmers needed harvesters, then, they were a welcome labor. I left that in because I got that statement from one of the white officials at camp.

Management did not screen it as they generally do, and they gave me prime time on December 7 to air it. A week in advance, they started to publicize it. They put a certain amount of money into it, publicizing the fact that it was a minority reporter doing a big story of the Japanese internment camps. They gave it a great deal of coverage. They had reviews in the newspapers, and some of the reviews got very bad letters, even before the program was on the air. These were from members of our audience who thought it was irresponsible for a good station like KOMO to bend so low as to give coverage to the enemy. When the program was aired, there was an enormous number of phone calls and almost all of them were against the program. The criticism was that they did not believe the Japanese reporter should be doing it, especially since she was so young, that she was unqualified to know what the camp was all about. But I did win two big awards, a local Emmy for individual achievement, and a first place in TV documentaries from Sigma Delta Chi for excellence in journalism.

Now this experience told me that maybe the people were ready to see and listen to the Asian story. So I started to go out independently on stories of my own on minorities. However, I was told by management that I would have to lay low on that because I had been doing too much of it. So I haven't been able to do as much as I would like to do.

Another big change that came about was that management wanted more of my face to be on the screen to show that there was a minority on the staff. I'm more visible than a white reporter. You see a lot of white reporters on TV all the time and when you see the yellow face and dark hair it sort of jars you and everyone remembers who you are. So they created a new morning format and they asked me to be a co-host. I didn't really like the idea at first because I think of myself as a professional reporter. I've got my own brain, I don't want to be a sex symbol or anything. I went on with the stipulation that OK I'll guest if I do my own news features on any subject that I choose.

In the news business you're a professional, and the only way you can get ahead is to move to a news director or move to a larger market. I have no chance of being a news director on account of my sex and my race. However, there is the chance of my going to a larger market such as Los Angeles or San Francisco because it's really the vogue now to be a minority. So I can see my chances.

However, I do not want to leave until there are more people qualified in Seattle. I think it's important that we get more qualified minority people in the news business because news people tend to be insensitive to the problems of minority people because they never associate personally with us. For instance, there are many comments made in the newsroom that are very derogatory to any kind of minority. When they abbreviate Japanese to Jap, it just infuriates me. But I let it be known, and they are more careful about it.

I went to a press conference for Lt. Cdr. Skip Brunhaver, the ex-POW from Bremerton. Some reporter had the gall to ask him if he still liked rice. That's like asking the Japanese Americans who came out of the concentration camp if they still liked Vienna sausages. Rice is associated with the slant-eyed yellow enemy. I liked Skip Brunhaver's remark, "I have no aversion to it." The fact that the reporters seemed to use stereotypic derogatory images and questions really bothered me. One of the biggest problems that minorities face is the type of press coverage that they get and the images that are projected in the media. The only way to change it is to get into the system.

The press has been criticized by the government, the left wing, the right wing, conservatives, liberals, and they will say the press is just an instrument of the establishment. They think that all we do is sound off the administration's viewpoint, and we are being used and manipulated. Look at how the government uses the press. They call press conferences, make all these statements, and then sit back and just check to see how the people are going to respond. This is the way they use the press. But at the same time, a lot of people have gotten very sophisticated and know how to use the press. They call their own press conference and they stage their demonstrations for the purpose of the press. For instance, there may be trouble at Seattle Community College. They call us and say, "We're going to riot in 15 minutes and we would appreciate some coverage." If there is a demonstration scheduled we'll go down to check out how large it is, and the minute the press, the TV cameras and reporters show up, then they will start raising cain. They know how to use the press. But the Asians do not use those tactics. They are different. They don't demonstrate, riot, and occupy buildings. However, I think they are being terribly neglected and I would like to see more Asians in the media, working within the media, not just to use the media.

There is another point that I'd like to make. Whenever people look at me, like producers, news writers, reporters, the first thing they see is an Oriental. They don't see a reporter first. As a result I feel that I have some responsibility to the Asian community. I feel that by their perception of me they are given an image of what they feel a Japanese American is like. There is no way I can discount that thought, and I don't want to because I'm very proud of being a Japanese American. However, I am a journalist and that means I do not participate in the demonstrations or controversial issues. I sit back and I observe and I report what I see in the most balanced manner that I can. When you take those things into account it is very hard to cover Asian issues or Asian topics.

For instance, when the domed stadium demonstration occurred, there were a group of Asians there. They were demonstrating because they did not want that domed stadium in their neighborhood. However, the reporter whom we had down there was a white reporter that covers City Hall. This was his beat. He was very upset at the Asians because they attacked him as a reporter for not covering the Asian demonstration first instead of emphasizing the domed stadium. When that reporter came back and wrote the story, he called the Asians "hecklers." I questioned him about it and he did admit that was an error on his part. However, he had been so infuriated by this attack on him personally, that he just did it, almost without thinking, and we did have quite a few calls from Asians who objected to that kind of coverage. I know he is a very good reporter and he does his best to be unbiased as possible. This was the first time that he had encountered Asians in such an unusual manner. He had admired them and respected them for the mature handling of a situation, but at this time, he said, they behaved like wild animals. I could understand his viewpoint and at the same time I could understand the frustration of the Asians. If I were covering the story in the same way I'm sure I would have been attacked, but because I happen to be the same race, I probably would have covered it a little differently, giving the Asian angle. That's the way I would do it because I feel that Asians are being neglected and the International District people have been neglected.

I would like to see more Asians going into communications, more Asians working on newspapers - not necessarily to have your face grace the screen, but to let other newsmen become aware of what it is like to be non-white. They just don't understand. Before I became a journalist I thought of myself as Japanese American in the sense that I had the traditional viewpoint on how I was supposed to behave. When I got into the press I realized how aggressive you had to be and I had to discard those fixed things that you had grown up with, and you had to be just as aggressive as anyone else. As a result I have become much more outspoken - I probably lose my temper a lot more in the newsroom because unless you do everyone ignores you, no matter how loud you yell. You've got to make a lot of noise. And I think my presence there probably helps them understand what it means to be an Asian or what the Asian viewpoint must be.

Quite a few times, I noted that the Asian organizations' press releases were being completely ignored and thrown in the wastepaper basket. And I salvage them and say, "Why can't you cover this story? It's just as newsworthy as Bobo being taken to his funeral or Fifi going to Hawaii." As a result, they think about it and say, "Who is this guy, how important is he?" And I will say, "He's the Japanese ambassador to the United States and you should go cover it and see him." Or they will come and say, "What about this story on acupuncture, do you really think it deserves some attention?" And I say, "Yes, I think it is one of the most exciting events that is going to happen in Western medicine, why don't we go cover it?" Some of the questions they ask me are ridiculous. It's just benign ignorance. They are not being malicious.

I spoke to the associate editor of the Seattle Times. I asked, "Why aren't there Asian reporters on your staff?" And he said, "Well, we have one Asian. She's our receptionist." This type of thing. I asked our radio people why weren't there any Asians on the radio staff and they said, "Well most Asians don't have resonant voices that we like to hear." That is their reasoning. I feel it is totally ridiculous, but they point out that their audience likes the type of voice that is soothing and doesn't retain an accent, that is full of authority. They don't want to hear the Asian accent. We are dictated to by the white majority. While I think we should keep in mind that we are a minority and less than 1% of the population that doesn't mean we should be ignored all of the time and there is a great deal that we can contribute.

DOES THE STATION MAKE CONCERTED EFFORTS TO HIRE MINORITIES AFTER THE SO-CALLED QUOTAS BY FCC HAVE BEEN FILLED?

No they don't. Within the first two months that I worked there, they told me that they would like to hire another Asian because there were only two Asians at that time. And so they asked me to notify my friends, which I did, and they hired someone. Then just within the past month there was another vacancy as production assistant. But this position would be much more valuable to an Asian because it would build up Asian's experience in TV. For that job I contacted the Asian-American Advisory Council Director and he called quite a few people telling them about this position. Well, I got chewed out by the program director because he said I had no right to go talk to my friends about this job. They had many people who were on file at that time. And when I mentioned that there weren't many Asians on the staff, he completely blew his top and said, "Look at all these white people that are unemployed." In effect, he was saying, "We're going to pick them first, and then we will go to the Asians." I'm not exactly sure about the quota of minorities required but there is no active recruitment to get minorities. The only reason I got in was because the news director really did need a minority quickly, and I had very good recommendations from one of my professors who also happened to be producer of ABC News and highly regarded by the profession. Also my instructor happened to have a favor coming from the news director.

IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IN 1970 THE FCC ISSUED NEW REGULATIONS RELATING TO EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES. THIS SPELLED OUT VERY CLEARLY THAT THE NEWS MEDIA WAS TO PROVIDE EQUIPMENT, TRAINING, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION AT EVERY LEVEL AND THAT THEY WOULD BE REQUIRING YEARLY REPORTS OF PROGRESS. DO YOU KNOW IF THAT KIND OF REPORTING HAS BEEN DONE?

I believe that is all handled by people upstairs. However, as far as promotions, of the three Asians at this station, one was a film editor, one was me, and one was a secretary. The film editor was promoted to TV sales coordinator, which is something like middle management. But it's the only advancement I've seen at the station for our group in two or three years. I've been promoted because I went up the scale from apprentice to reporter. That's just one jump, and I am classified as an Oriental professional female. I pick up three classifications. I was told that I am probably more valuable to the newsroom than an ordinary white male reporter because I make up these three beautiful things.

DOES THE STATION AT THIS TIME HAVE ANY SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAM FOR MINORITIES?

No, not specifically for minorities.

DO YOU THINK THE MEDIA PROFESSION WOULD BE AMENABLE TO SOME KIND OF SEMINAR WORKSHOP?

No. Most people in the broadcast industry - we're talking about news reporters - are very low paid, and they work very hard. And they wouldn't have the time. The best way to do it is to get the people before they go in the business and this means when they are in college. Now when they are in college, not only should they be taught the principles of affective journalism but also the affects of journalism toward people - all kinds of people, because when you go through school the audience that you aim for is white. When you get into the business you have to learn by trial and error but there are different kinds of people that you are going to be reporting for. If there were to be a seminar I would advise it only for the news directors or producers, or filing editors and producers.

Now many people are encouraged to go into communications because it is a small market, and there are a lot of people and a lot of talent. Asians are not particularly encouraged any more than other non-white minorities. The industry is so limited that at least 20-50 people apply for one small position in a TV station. The only way that the hiring person would consider you is if you have got a college degree and if you have had several years of experience in the print media, radio, or a small monthly. So that means that many people who graduate from the University with a degree in communications go to Bellingham, or Chehalis, or Yakima to get experience first, and then they enter the Seattle market which is considered one of the strongest in the nation in broadcasting.

WOULD YOU SAY IT'S EVEN HARDER FOR MINORITIES TO GET IN THE INDUSTRY BECAUSE THE INDUSTRY IS RESPONSIVE TO THE OPINIONS OF THE PUBLIC?

That would have been true maybe ten years ago and maybe ten years from now. However, at this time, it is fashionable to get a minority reporter. Right now is a good time for a minority to break into the TV business. However, once a station feels it has enough minority persons, no doubt it will close it down and get more whites.

YOUR DOCUMENTARY WAS DONE IN YOUR SPARE TIME, ON WEEKENDS AND AT NIGHT. IF THE SUBJECT WAS CONSIDERED TO BE IMPORTANT, THAT WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN THE CASE, WOULD IT?

No. However, I was willing to put forth the effort and the station being business minded thought that if she's willing to work weekends, let her do it. They were short handed, they needed my body to do all these stories, mickey-mouse, and children's orthopedic, and so forth, but I'll have to say that the station bent over backwards to let us do the documentary. They paid our fare to Idaho and back, they didn't ask any questions at all about some of our expenditures; in fact, after the documentary was done, the president of the station came down and congratulated me on "a beautiful story of a beautiful people." And that was more than I could ask for because the president is noted for not speaking to anyone. I was very pleased.

I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE MEDIA SEEKING SENSATIONALISM. THERE WAS AN ACCIDENT AT THE STADIUM SITE AND THE NEWS PEOPLE SEEMED TO BE CONCERNED MOST ABOUT INTERVIEWING FRANK RUANO WHO SAID THE PILLARS FELL DOWN BECAUSE THERE WAS AN ORIENTAL HEX ON IT. THERE WAS A SHOOTING LAST WEEKEND AND A BLACK POLICE OFFICER AND A YOUNG FILIPINO WERE KILLED. WHY DO THEY PUT A HANDLE ON THE MINORITIES AND DON'T DO IT ON THE WHITE FOLKS?

It is up to the individual reporter. Many of the reporters feel that if the person is white they just get his name; if a person is of a different color they will give his color, because they feel it adds to the story - a skin color. Also the three different stations operate under three different policies. KING and KIRO tend to be a little more sensational because of their news format. They love editorial content with the reporter's stories. They like little things that add a bit of color to the story. Now if you look at KOMO, it's completely sterile. There are just the facts. When you see one story on all three stations there's going to be a difference in the telling. There are faults in both approaches. When you give only facts you don't get to relate to some kinds of people, but in editorial comments, you do an injustice by making yourself a censor of the news. However, I see no way to correct this other than to make more responsible reporters. You mentioned the one in the Central Area where the black officer was shot and the Filipino boy was killed. It was interesting because both parties were minorities and a bunch of irate mothers called the station because there was not a white man involved. If there was a white man involved, doubtless we would have had many many calls saying why wasn't this better covered, why didn't you put more research into it. And they would have asked some more questions but, oh well, it was just two minorities that got killed.

ADDENDUM

No minority employees were found in the four upper categories of jobs - managerial, professional, technical, and sales - at 34% of 60 TV stations reported in this study. More than 2/3 of the full-time employment at these stations consisted of positions in these upper four job categories. The per cent of minority employees in these categories rose from 7% to 8%, a gain of 1% from 1971 to 1972. In the top ten television markets, where the average minority population is 34%, average employment of minorities at TV stations amounted to 14.5%. In the Oriental category, of those in the four upper brackets, there was a gain in numbers from 131 to 152 from 1971 to 1972, but this 152 represents but 0.56% of the total (27,131) employed in these four brackets.

"These statistics show how little opportunity there is for blacks, Orientals, Indians, citizens of Spanish background and women to obtain jobs in television and forge ahead." - Dr. E. C. Parker.

From Broadcasting, November 27, 1972. Report at a news conference on a study conducted by Office of Communication, United Church of Christ, New York.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) require radio and TV stations to submit affirmative action programs aimed at increasing minority job opportunities at all levels, together with goals, timetables, and documentation of recruitment, hiring, training, and promotional efforts. These programs should be reviewed by the local Fair Employment Practice agency. The FCC should make it clear that failure to comply may result in the withholding of license renewals as well as fines.

2. That the FCC establish a civil rights office with staff to fulfill all civil rights functions such as review and assessment of minority hiring progress; development and requirement of human relations training for news directors and producers.

3. That the FCC establish a national council composed of minorities to be advisory to the communications media.

4. That the major broadcasters and newspapers appoint equal employment opportunities officers; develop and promote training programs to prepare employed minorities for upward mobility, as well as provide minority communications students with on-the-job training which will carry college credits; and provide scholarships to minority students.

5. That the communications industries visit high schools with high minority enrollment to discuss the communications field such as the requirements, the training programs, the scholarships, etc.

6. That the broadcast industries work with citizen advisory groups to develop public service announcements of community concerns and events.

7. That the communications media initiate reporter exchange programs, e.g., between radio KYAC and KIRO, between Post-Intelligencer and Asian Family Affair, etc.

8. That the communications media assign specific reporter(s) to cover minority stories as an ongoing assignment in order to handle such stories with depth and perception.

9. That procedures be established to screen television advertising, newspaper cartoons and comic strips to eliminate demeaning, stereotyped characterizations of ethnic and racial groups.

10. That we examine the possibility of filing suit for disparate effects to minorities against newspapers or broadcasting industries.

ASIAN STEREOTYPES

Maxine Chan
Denise Louie

Television

Television, a relatively recent intruder into our homes, has done much to propagate stereotypes of Asian Americans and Asians. One of the most popular shows, "All in the Family," is an example.

Archie Bunker is fine if you can understand that it's a take-off on racism in the country. But for many who cannot perceive it as satire, that it is not "real life," it only reconfirms their suspicions of Asians. Some people of the older generation, maybe from World War II, who still harbor hatred against the Japanese, say that if it's OK for TV, if Archie Bunker can do it, then, it's OK for them to do it, too. They're going to go out and call us "gooks."

Another show which draws much criticism is "Kung Fu." This show portrays a half Chinese-half white priest who flees from China to America. Each segment focuses on one of his adventures as he wanders across Western America. In January, 1972, a particularly offending segment was aired: Caine, the priest, is in this town and his friend is killed. The people who killed him were white; the people who knew about this were Chinese. Caine was trying to make this Chinese family testify against these white people. This event takes place in 1870, but remember that in 1863, a California law was passed that no Chinese could testify against a white man in court. The producers are telling us that white society was good to the Chinese and that nothing really bad happened. But a lot of bad things did happen.

In a recent cartoon show many blatant, and not so blatant, racist remarks and images were introduced. In the cartoon, the Osmonds are in China where they begin their world-wide tour. Though this is contemporary China, when the boys step off the plane they are greeted by Chinese people who are wearing queues, a symbol of Manchu domination which was actually abolished at the turn of the century. The women all have long flowing black hair, although the generally accepted haircut for women in the People's Republic of China is short. The people are slant-eyed and very humble. The star, Donny, falls in love with one of the young Chinese girls on the nation's ping pong team. Curiously enough, she is the only Chinese who has "acceptable" Western features. Danny gives her a Western-style dress and she is instantly transformed into a vision of beauty and innocence. Donny sings to her while leaping from head to head of coolie laborers. As a last blow to Asian dignity the show portrays the leader of the ping pong team as an inept, clumsy player, who wins only because the Osmonds have previously agreed to throw the game.

There is a Doral cigarette commercial in which a Chinese waiter is holding up a package of Dorals. He says, "Confucius say, "Don't knock it until you've tried it." That's just like saying, "Jesus Christ says, "Don't knock it until you've tried it." The crack about Confucius is just so insensitive. The producers of the commercials are making fun of our way of life, of our philosophy.

Movies

The image of the Asian and of the Asian American is not that of real life but rather that of the white society's stereotype.

"No one considers them (Asians) outside of their stereotyped roles. Whites have played Asians in leading roles so often that producers look for the stereotyped mannerism when they cast. When they audition for a real Asian, he's a human being and not a stereotype. Therefore, since he doesn't fit into their idea of an Asian, they say he lacks personality, charisma, or talent." (Paik).[1]

All the various Charlie Chans have been played by white actors - Warner Oland, Sidney Fox, Roland Winters, J. Carroll Naish, Ross Martin. Throughout the many years of his portrayal by the several actors who played him, Charlie Chan, the detective, has consistently come across with "the inscrutable attitude, the faked accent, the folded hands, the slight bow, the pigeon-toed stance." (Paik)[1]

Further, movies have used real Asians to play fools, or to provide comic relief, or to play cruel, sadistic villains, such as Fu Manchu. While the Fu Manchu movies themselves are offensive, the advertisements used in the promotion of the films are even worse. Fu Manchu is referred to as a "slant-eyed villain," a "machine." The ruthlessness of this, as well as other Asian villains, has "played upon the 'yellow peril' theme popularized by pulp magazines, cheap novels, and the Hearst press. This treatment of Asians was widely accepted and very popular..." (Paik)[1]

When I was younger and the Fu Manchu and the Charlie Chan movies were still playing, I knew, because I am Chinese, that these movies were and are just plain fantasy. We are not really like that: we are not evil or terrible as Fu Manchu; we're not also as smart and as humble as Charlie Chan. But people who don't have any contact with any other Asians believe these things. It touches them. It affects them very much because they don't know what we are for real. The only way they know us is through the mass media. The mass media is constantly portraying Asians and Chinese in these ways. People see these movies, watch TV, see us portrayed in this way and really begin to believe it. And when they go down to Chinatown, they expect to see all these exotic places, expect to see the gambling joints that constitute the opium den, and the little men who come out through the alleys at night with hatchets in their hands.

---

[1] Paik, Irvin, "That Oriental Feeling: A Look at the Caricatures of the Asians As Sketched by American Movies," in Roots: An Asian American Reader, (Eds.) A. Tachiki, E. Wong, F. Odo, and B. Wong, Continental Graphics, Los Angeles, 1971.

Comic Books

Comic books have various subjects ranging from adventure to romance, from fantasy to historical novelettes; they are generally aimed at younger children, and the images portrayed leave strong and lasting impressions on young minds. The Asians have consistently been stereotyped in these.

DC Comics has a hero named Blackhawk, who is white. Blackhawk's side kick is Chinese: he is very short - barely reaching Blackhawk's waist, wears a short queue, has buck teeth and slits for eyes, and carries a Chinese cleaver or hatchet. In short, Chop Chop, as he is called, looks like a half-human imp. A particular Blackhawk story, originally published in 1946, was re-released in 1972 in a 100-page super-spectacular.

Dennis the Menace (Fawcett Comics), is a great offender. In a recent issue, Dennis, a little blond boy, randomly calls a number on the phone. The man on the other end happens to be someone living in Hong Kong. This man is shown to have buck teeth and slits for eyes. He cannot pronounce his "r's" and he wears a Japanese style kimono. The wife of the Hong Kong resident states quite clearly a Japanese stereotyped cliché, "ah, so." Dennis orders the man to speak English when he is answered in a foreign language. Later Dennis tells his father that the man talked funny.

In another Dennis the Menace adventure, Dennis and his family go out to dinner at a Chinese restaurant. All the waiters have buck teeth and slits for eyes. Whenever the cartoonist thinks it is funny not to be able to pronounce the "r's," the waiters cannot. The waiter says "sweet and sour spareribs" with no trouble, but stumbles over "flied lice, velly good." Dennis considers the restaurant "scary"; he ridicules the Chinese teacups because they don't have handles; he doubts the food because he doesn't know what it is; he ridicules chopsticks because he cannot use them properly.

Textbooks and Other Educational Tools

I work at a restaurant out in Federal Way, close to Tacoma, about twenty miles out of Seattle. It is a virtually all-white community. This young man and I were talking and he said, "I'll bet your dad used to smoke opium when he was younger."

I said, "I beg your pardon?"

"I know all about those Asians."

"Where did you hear about those Asians?" I asked.

He answered, "From my minorities class."

There's something wrong with his history books. We're using one, a history book, at Cleveland High School. It's pretty big, but in that whole book, there are only two lines mentioning that the Japanese were put in concentration camps. Well, this book is supposed to be one of the best ones in the city. I really, really want to know what the ones used in the other schools are like.

Textbook bias is found not only in the kindergarten through twelfth grades, but also on the more enlightened college campus. The following is a paragraph from a college textbook called Empire of the Columbia.[1] The 685-page book relates the history and development of the Pacific Northwest, and is able to do it by barely mentioning the Chinese only three times and "Japanese" and Filipino" are not even in the index. The following is a paragraph which talked about Chinese labor in the Columbia River salmon canneries in the 1880's:

"It was an unwritten law that a Chinese would be shot on sight if he was found fishing, but he was accepted in the canneries without resentment since the plants had to have cheap labor if they were to operate at all. Chinese workers were faithful and, if properly treated, were well behaved." (underline ours)

A few weeks ago, I was at Nathan Hale High School at a wrestling meet. Right next to the gym there was a bulletin board on which was a collage made up of all these pictures of black models you get in the magazines, interspersed with white people. Now the caption read, "Co-existence or not existence." That was a pretty nice gesture, except that there were no other minorities - there were just the blacks and the whites. It didn't include the yellow, or the brown, or the red. Does that mean that the Asians and the browns and the reds have made it? That the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino are white now? That the whites don't have to try to co-exist with us? Or does that mean that we don't even rate co-existence?

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That TV and movie producers be required to actively recruit and place Asian actors in roles depicting Asians in other than stereotyped roles and that they use Asian consultants to advise in the accuracy of roles and events.

2. That television stations consult with the Asian American Advisory Council with regard to the impact of programs and advertising upon Asians since stereotyping may be harmful to the health, welfare, and safety of the public.

3. That television stations increase the number of public service programs dealing with the problems of Asians.

4. That the Superintendent of Public Instruction establish a multi-ethnic committee to review textbooks, current and anticipated, and accept recommendations as to appropriate and inappropriate teaching material to produce a more balanced view of the Asians in America.

---

[1] Johansen, O. and Gates, C. M., Empire of the Columbia, Harper & Row, N.Y. 1957.

5. That the Comic Code Authority have an Asian input to enforce a code of ethics for comic book publishers and distributors.

6. That "awareness" sessions be conducted for radio, TV, and newspaper management.

CONTRACTORS AND UNIONS

Jim Takisaki

I'm here to speak about the discrimination in the construction industry. Since Asians are so young, so new in the construction industry it is very hard for me to talk for any length of time. I'd like to tell you some things about the Davis-Bacon Act[1] and the Miller Act.[2] They were designed by the white man to exclude all minorities. The Davis-Bacon Act means a prevailing wage and the Miller Act is a bonding issue that only the white people are able to get - no matter what kind of a financial statement you may show. You ask them what their guidelines are and they will tell you, "Well we have no guidelines; we want to go by a track record." How do you get a track record? You get a track record by performing. You can't perform if the unions don't let you perform, so we have a stand-off. It's always the same old run-around. You get the job, we'll give you the bond; or we'll give you a bond if you get the job. These are the things that we are up against constantly in the construction industry. We are talking now about a 105 billion dollar industry, nationally; and the minorites make up 20% of the national geographic population - still we participate in half of 1% of the construction dollar. This surpasses the Department of Defense and Department of Agriculture. Health, Education and Welfare is the only industry that is larger than the construction industry. It's time that we look up and see that we get our fair share.

It really disheartens me when the government keeps telling us that they're going to make sure of affirmative action. Executive Order No. 11246 (1965) clearly tells us that we minorities are supposed to get our fair share and still we only participate at less than one half of 1%. There must be some way that we should be able to penetrate the construction dollar. Now Asians are known to have a high education level. I, for one, have no education and I feel that I am fairly comfortable in what I'm doing. If you have a high school education you can get into the construction industry. But how can you get in? The unions have an exclusive hiring hall which is done through the apprenticeship committee. That is all white oriented, and the way you get in is that you have to pass a test. They can tell you what grade level you are. I just can't believe how they treat you. So when you go up there and say, "Well, I feel like a third-year indenture,[1] they say you aren't even six months indenture. Then, if you get in the union some way or the other, your name will come up and they will give you a job and send you way over to Bremerton and you have no way of getting there. And if you have no way of getting there they say that's your tough luck, and you go back to the bottom of the list. In the city of Seattle, I believe the Asians make up between 5 and 6% of the population and still we participate in less than one tenth of 1% of the construction dollar. In the state of Washington there were 435 million dollars worth of highway work done in the last fiscal year and still we participated in zero amount of dollars - zero - not any amount of the highway dollars. And they tell us that we should participate in all these things.

---

[1] Federal law specifying minimum prevailing wages in various crafts according to geographic areas.

[2] Federal bonding act which allows construction contractors to post a minimum bond.

I'd like to cite one example of Operation Breakthrough[2] where Affirmative Action is assured by the government. An Asian contractor got a job at the Woodinville Breakthrough site. The job was bid at $1,234,000. We were $2600 lower than the next competitive bidder, a white company, but they still awarded the contract to the white contractor, and we wondered why; and they went and changed the bid. They flew out on a Sunday afternoon and they changed the bid and flew back. Well we made a big stink about it and we finally got half of it. We settled for half. They said they were caught with their hand in the cookie jar. Well we would rather take half than nothing. Even if you win the job you don't get the job and if you do win the job you can't get a bond.

There's a 1971 housing act that says that all minorities will get a share; the SBA (Small Business Administration) will guarantee $500,000 on any type of bonding for 90% of the bond. The bonding companies don't want to go along with that. Even if the SBA will guarantee our bond, the bonding company will say, "No, we don't want to do that."

They have now set up a program called the 8A program to the SBA to help disadvantaged and minority contractors. These are contracts set out to show that they are given to minorities on a negotiated basis. You don't have to bid on these jobs because they are on a negotiated basis. Every job that you get is designed to break you. In Washington, D.C. last year, the SBA head man will get up there and rap about how much he is doing for minorities. Well, I say how much he is doing to break them all, because they are set up to negotiate these contracts and they put such rigid standards on them that I just can't believe what they do. I was awarded two little 8A contracts - one to do Judge Morell Sharp's office down here for an amount of $19,274, and one to do the Redmond Coast Guard station down here at $21,800. I'm not 100% accurate on my figures. They gave me those jobs; I did the jobs; I didn't make a dime. But I got a pat on the back from them, and I get a one-sentence letter from them saying, "You are now a viable contractor and you are removed from the 8A list. I'm viable? I owe $50,000 and I'm viable. If you don't give me more jobs how am I going to pay you back the $50,000? But they still say I can go out and do this type of work.

---

[1] Training period of apprentice.

[2] Federal low income housing projects.

We have written several letters to the President of the United States asking him not to appoint Mr. Brennan to become the next Secretary of Labor. We have written this nationally, with Chicano names, Japanese names, Indian names, black names - from the National Association of Minority Contractors, and he just lends a deaf ear to us. Since Brennan has come in we have lost Art Fletcher, we have lost Samuel Simmons, we have lost John Wilkes, we've lost Samuel Jackson, we have lost all the top minorities in the Administration in this area. Now we have a man like Brennan come in who is president of the building trades in New York who is a known racist. We wonder what type of chance we do have now. I've been back to Washington, D.C. three times and talked to, at that time, Secretary of Labor Schultz, and then it became James Hodgson who was a secretary. Secretary Hodgson was very receptive to our needs - very sensitive to the Asian needs, I would say. He talked to me personally - on the side. He would talk to me and say, "You know, you have to make more noise, you have to do more things." Now some way or other he and Nixon got in some kind of hassle and he got thrown out of there. So I'm just wondering where we're going to go from here. We had a great friend in Senator Birch Bayh. He has done an awful lot for the blacks and other minorities. And he says that at every one of our conferences, that black may be beautiful but not to the bonding company. These are the things - when they say black, I want to make it very clear to you, that when they say black, they mean black and other minorities.

WHEN THEY SAID THAT YOU WERE NOW A VIABLE CONTRACTOR, DOES THAT MEAN THAT YOU GET CAUGHT IN THE BONDING HASSLE?

That's right. Now if I come by, they won't give me any backing on bonding. That's exactly right.

DOES THAT MEAN YOU CAN'T TURN DOWN THAT STATUS? IF THEY SAY YOU'RE A VIABLE CONTRACTOR, YOU'VE GOT TO ACCEPT THIS?

I have to accept it, except that I belong to the National Minorities Contractors Board of Directors, and they're putting pressure on them (SBA) and so maybe they'll put me back on the list. But one of the reasons I believe that they are putting me on the list is to make themselves look good also, because they have to show that they have made a couple of minority contractors viable, which they haven't done. I think that's one of the reasons.

WHEN YOU SAY BONDING, THAT'S A PERFORMANCE BOND YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT?

Performance and a payment bond.

IN YOUR OPINION DO YOU THINK THAT THE SBA IS DISCRIMINATING AGAINST ASIANS OVER BLACKS?

No, that's not true at all because any time you're not white - anybody that is not a white person hasn't got a chance. Take my brother-in-law - the other day, he won a job for $13,645. Here is a man who has a nice home, got a fairly good net worth, spotless credit - he goes down to get a bond, and the company, they say No. I said I can't understand it. We had to use every trick in the book and finally I said I would even co-sign for the bond. They didn't even want to do that. This is what we have to fight. So we said, "What are your guidelines, tell me?" They said, "There is no guideline. Whatever we feel. Let's see your track records." How can you have a track record when you can't even get in the unions to have a track record?

DOESN'T THE LENDING INSTITUTION SET UP THE GUIDELINE AND INSTRUCT THE INSURANCE COMPANY?

That's not true because the lending institution is the one that takes the beating. If you don't perform and you walk off the job, the lending institution says, "Well, we have advanced so much for the job, who's going to finish it?", and they look to the bonding company. So you can't blame the lending institution. That's why the government has come through with a 1971 housing act which clearly states that they will bond any minority up to half a million dollars, and guarantee 90% of it. But half a million when you're talking about a hundred five billion industry is not even ash in the ashtray.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF THE UNIONS IN THE CONSTRUCTION TRADES? THERE ARE SEVERAL - IRON WORKERS, SHEET METAL WORKERS, ELECTRICIANS, AND OTHERS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DESIGNED TO GET MINORITIES INTO THE UNIONS, LIKE THE LINDBERG COURT ORDER PLAN.

I'm glad you asked that question because I happen to belong to Judge Lindberg's committee. Here we have a court order - the first time in the history of the United States where the Justice Department has come down and said the unions are discriminatory. We are to get 90 blacks - when they state blacks, they mean minorities, and I think everybody knows what I'm talking about. I discussed it with the judge, I tried to resign from the committee, and he wants me on there because they don't really mean black. They were the ones that were making the noise, and so they were the ones that said 90 blacks. The union says they will cooperate in any way they can. There happens to be 10 people on this committee: two from labor, two from management, four from the minority community, one from the state, and one from the county. Then if there is a 5/5 stand-off, we have Prof. Rieke who is chairman of the committee who will break the tie on any voting. In the last three years, the ironworkers have just flagrantly gone out and kept hiring whites when the quota said no more whites and, by attrition, we will just take in blacks and minorities to make up this quota. They have just flagrantly kept hiring the whites. I think there are 14 blacks in the ironworkers, which is about the most discriminatory of them all. We went down and fought with them last week. Next Tuesday they're having a meeting at 10 o'clock down at the AGC (Associated General Contractors). The four minorities are going to boycott that meeting. We're going to haul them back in court. They are in contempt of court, but they keep doing it and they feel that they can do that because we are not going to do anything about it. But we're going to boycott this meeting Tuesday. They're not going to see us there because we're not going to go along and hear all that rhetoric. The whites are getting hired and the blacks are just shoved aside. They put the program (apprentice training) way down on Marginal Way someplace, way out, and a lot of the blacks - because of the 40% unemployeumnt, they don't even have a car to get out there. I'm asking them to put it out there in the Central Community to our own home territory. Automatically when you go out there you are discriminated against. You feel very insecure anyway because you are there because of a court order and all the whites are looking down your throat. What's he doing here? We don't need him. And they wonder why the blacks are dropping out so fast. What the white man tells me, "Oh no, they're just lazy. They don't want to go to class." The unions are just our worst enemy. I remember personally being turned down from the union. This wasn't in the construction industry... They told me to go get a job first, a salesman. I go to apply for a job at several big car agencies right after the war. The doors are closed. They say OK you can get it if you get a card from the union. They won't give you a card and so you go back and try to start one of your own. They come and put a picket all around your place. A place on 12th and Main, when I was there.

I just don't know the answers, but I know if we don't start making a noise we're not going to get any of the dollars, whether it be in construction or otherwise. And what concerns me very much now is because a lot of the younger generation aren't going to be so sophisticated and educated, and they can make a good amount of dollars in the construction industry without this education. When you get a blue-collar worker, a plumber that makes $9.74 an hour - you know that's almost $20,000 a year. And you take a good highly educated person with a bachelors degree or a masters degree, it's pretty hard for him to make that kind of money. So I'd really like to see some younger Asians get in the construction industry.

DO YOU SEE ANY PARTICULAR PROBLEMS THAT MINORITY CONTRACTORS HAVE THAT PERHAPS WHITE CONTRACTORS WOULD NOT HAVE WITH UNIONS?

Of course, I see that all the time. I think that one big problem we have - a minority contractor has - he has to depend on his labor pool from the union. When the union sees it's a minority contractor, it seems like it's designed to break the minority contractor, they send the worst workmen up. I would like to cite an example. One of my very dear friends in San Francisco is an Asian plumber. He was doing small work with most of the work in Chinatown, but he was doing very well. So they wanted to get a minority contractor to become viable in the mechanical industry so they pushed him up and got him up there into the bigger league. As soon as he got there, they started sending him the worst help that he could get. He could not hire anybody but minorities when he was working at Hunters Point, which is a completely black area in San Francisco. They would send him the worst people - the union would. When he'd go out there - I rode out with him a couple of times - and when he got in trouble, we asked them, "How come you haven't laid more pipes?" "Oh, well, they just did the best they could". Well they're supposed to lay 30 pipes for 30 feet; they would only lay 18. We'd argue with them and they would say, "See if you can get me fired. Call the union man up." The union would say, "Well, keep them there until I get there." The next day the union man shows up and in a few minutes the guy is back there working. You just can't fight it. If you send somebody home they will send you somebody worse than that. They do this constantly.

THERE ARE SOME RUMBLES AROUND ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PHYSICAL THREATS AND PHYSICAL VIOLENCE OF THE WHITE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS AND UNION MEMBERS TOWARD MINORITY GROUPS. HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THAT?

Oh I've heard that many times. Every time we've been around these construction sites we've been warned through the inside that a lot of the construction workers have carried irons in their lunch bucket and they are ready to fight in any way possible. They're not going to put up with us any longer. But I don't know. I think the only way we're going to get anything is to go back on the streets, and I hate to say that because everybody says that it's a thing of the past, but I see no other way for us to get our fair share. We're only asking them to enforce the law. We're not breaking the law. They say we're breaking the law when they put a restriction on it. We're only asking that they give us our fair share of the action. The permanent order says to give us our fair share but they still don't want to do it and when we march we're breaking the law. But the white men, it's all right for him to break the law by not hiring us.

YOU SAID THAT EVEN WHEN THOSE PROGRAMS FOR MINORITES ARE ABLE TO GET SOME INTO TRAINEESHIPS, THE CONDITIONS ARE SUCH THAT IT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR THEM TO GET THE TRAINING. WHAT KIND OF TREATMENT AND JOB ASSIGNMENTS HAVE THEY RECEIVED?

Well since we've been monitoring the job - when I say we, I mean the United Construction Workers - things have been a lot better. But we still have the same problem of sending the fellow a way off someplace and saying if they can't get there, "Well that's too bad you can't take this job." They have been taking the worst end of the stick. They've been getting the dirtier jobs. We tell our men, "This is a part of growing up; we're going to have to suffer with it; and you're going to have to help us pioneer this; and show them that we're going to take it because if we don't, you know, we'll never get there." I see it all the time that they keep telling us that, "Well we're going to give the minorities a better break and get the better jobs," but it just doesn't happen. Just like the foreman might be a racist. He knows we're there because of a quota that they have to meet. Several times if there's nothing to do they will say, "Go sit in the shack - we have to pay you anyway - go sit in the shack." How can a minority learn by sitting in the shack? They'll pay you anyway. Go sit in the shack. This has happened many times. And we tell our men, "Don't sit in the shack." But we can't go out there because we'll get in a fight with them. So these are the things that we're going to have to look at and come to grips with and deal with.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That governmental bodies develop special affirmative action programs designed to enable minority contractors to receive contracts on construction funded by public monies.

2. That prime contractors be required to subcontract an equitable share to minority contractors where public funds are involved.

3. That union hiring hall procedures are monitored in such a way as to assure that dispatchers send out workers on a racially equitable basis.

4. That union hiring halls be required to submit reports detailing persons dispatched by race, jobs, locations, and contractors.

DRIVER'S LICENSE

Mrs. Y. D. Ho

I went to the Motor Vehicle License Department to get my driver's' license. This was in Everett, on November 24. When I was taking the driving part of the test, I approached an intersection. Because there was a big red light, I stopped. As I was sitting there, the man who was giving me the test told me to turn left. So I waited until a green light came up. When it turned green, I started to go, but he said that I went a little too fast. For that he penalized me 6 points; that gave me a total score of 94. That was the only mistake I made, but he said that I didn't pass the test and wouldn't give me the license.

I felt very unhappy, so I went back to the examiner's office. I asked one of the other examiners why he did not give me the license. The man asked, "Where are you from?"

I said, "I'm from Korea."

He said, "No, I don't think you came from Korea. You came from _____."

This is a town in Korea. All the GI's stationed between Seoul and the DMZ know this place. Many of the people there are easy pick-up girls (prostitutes). I do not know why he told me that I came from this town, but I think he looked down on the people from there. Maybe he was in Korea during the Korean War. If he wanted to test me, that's okay, but why mention the town in Korea?

I had already passed the written part of the exam earlier. I had a little problem because of my English, but I was able to pass anyway. I had only made one mistake on the driving part, but they did not give me my license.

Well, I felt the whole thing was discriminatory, so I came to Seattle that same afternoon. I took the driving test at the Green Lake testing station. There, I passed, so I finally got the license all right. Now the argument is, if I can get my license in Seattle, why can't I get it in Everett?

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Department of Motor Vehicles implement a series of minority human relations training sessions for its driver license examiners.

FIREFIGHTERS

Randall Foy

My complaint and problem is that I am not being covered under The Firemen's Pension System, even though I am a firefighter. I'll give you a brief history of the events.

Approximately three years ago, I entered the Minority Training Program with the Seattle Fire Department. This was a program to include minorities in the department. I took a physical given by a Health Department doctor and passed.

I was ordered to take another physical about a year after I began the trainee program. My fire pension doctor failed me. He said I had something wrong with my heart. This was the first indication that I had any type of heart problem. I have been active all my life - ran track in high school, spent three years in the Army and was discharged from the service after a full medical examination.

After this, I wanted to find out if possibly I did have a heart problem, so I went to some physicians of my own. First, I went to the chief cardiologist at Group Health Hospital. I was examined by him and he said that I was okay. I have a documented letter stating this. Next, I went to a senior fellow in cardiology at the University of Washington School of Medicine. The doctors there took two days to examine me. Their findings were that I didn't have any heart problem. The third doctor I went to was a private cardiologist who also came to the same conclusion as the other two doctors.

I had been in doubt until these doctors told me. After taking all this into consideration, I figured that I had a perfectly normal heart.

I then made an appeal to the Firemen's Pension Board, with these documented letters. The Board told me that it wouldn't take these specialists' word into consideration, and that it would only take the word of the Firemen's Pension doctor into consideration. The pension doctor had failed me, but he was not a specialist in cardiology, whereas all the other doctors I had gone to for further evaluation were specialists in cardiology. This struck me as peculiar. None of the four pension doctors are cardiologists.

At the end of training in the trainee program, I was advised by the Assistant Chief and Head of the Personnel Department, who is now retired, that I had an appointment with a cardiologist at Seattle Medical Surgical Clinic on Broadway. This was to be the final decision in resolving the problem of my heart. I went to this clinic and was tested for two days. The cardiologist documented this in a letter and told me that I was perfectly fine and qualified for the duties of a firefighter. He also told me that he would tell the Assistant Chief the same thing and that he would write letters about his findings to the proper authorities or agencies, and to Public

Service Careers, which was the coordinating agency with the city of Seattle and the Department. This promised letter showed up only after I had been later disqualified by the fire department doctor.[1] The letter, as I indicated before, said that I was okay and able to do the job of a firefighter.

A couple of days passed before I was notified to take the last half of my physical which concerned the eyes, ears, nose, and throat. Upon being examined at the Seattle Medical Surgical Clinic I was disqualified by the fire department doctor because of my heart. He's a surgeon; he's not a heart specialist. We had a little discussion about this and I asked him if he had taken the other doctor's findings into consideration. He stated to me that the other doctor wasn't the fire department doctor and that he was, therefore, he made the decision. He also said that I had high blood pressure.[2] But I had had my blood pressure taken at Group Health, and the Chief Cardiologist there had said my blood pressure then was normal.[3]

I made an appeal to the Civil Service Commission with facts and documented letters. After two lengthy discussions, the Civil Service Commission found that I had been dealt with unjustly as far as medical examinations were concerned, and wrote a letter to the Fire Chief, who is now retired, but who, at that time, was the chief of the department. This letter stated:

"The Civil Service Commission at its meeting October 20, 1971 reviewed the report on Randall Hugh Foy, fireman eligible for medical examination by the Fire Pension System examiners. After taking into consideration other medical reports furnished by Mr. Foy, the Commission rejected the examination report of the pension board doctors and retains Mr. Foy on the firemen's eligible register."

---

[1] The course of the cardiologist's letter of findings and recommendations is questionable. The letter had been dictated soon after the examination and sent to the Clinic steno-pool for transmittal to the concerned parties. Neither Mr. Foy nor the coordinator of the training program received copies although assured by the cardiologist that they would. However, the Assistant Chief did receive the letter soon after the examination; the coordinator was able to obtain a copy of the letter only after a direct request to the Chief by City Personnel. This was some 2½ weeks after the examination.

[2] The Fire Department doctor, in a medical report dated 9/27/71, found Mr. Foy's blood pressure to be 160/102, while sitting down. The doctor had insisted on taking the blood pressure measurement during this heated verbal exchange with Mr. Foy after the latter had challenged the doctor's categorical assertion of Mr. Foy's disqualification despite the cardiologist's recommendations.

[3] In a document signed by the cardiologist at Group Health Hospital, dated 12/2/70, Mr. Foy's blood pressure was recorded as 120/80; in another letter, dated 10/1/71, Mr. Foy's blood pressure over an average of six readings was recorded as 130-140/85. According to the Merck Manual, Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, 1966, p. 112, the average blood pressure is 120/80.

In short, I was finally hired by the city as a firefighter, but a representative from the Firemen's Pension System made a statement that although I had to be hired, I would not be covered by the Firemen's Pension Board because it felt that I didn't meet their standards.[1] In other words, the Civil Service Commission can hire me, but it has no control over the coverage by the Pension Board.

As a result of all this, I've been employed without the pension coverage for about a year and one month. With pension coverage I would have had retirement and disability benefits. This system is much more generous than State Industrial, which is what I have now. I am also paying for this coverage out of my own pocket.

I am not the only one involved with this problem. There are three of us - two blacks and myself, all minorities. I think one individual was supposed to have an abnormal back X ray, and the other one was supposed to have high blood pressure and a hernia. They went through the same procedures I did: they saw specialists, obtained documented proof, and then presented this to the Board, the Civil Service Commission at the same time I did. We went through the training program together, and through the same changes and obstacles together. So far, we've come out with the job, but with no coverage by the Pension System.

My complaint isn't against the guys I work with, of the fellow firefighters. I couldn't work with a better bunch of guys. A lot of them - the ones I work with - realize my problem and understand. I'd like to make this noted: this all happened under the old administration, not the new one. We have a new fire chief and a new assistant chief.

That's the way it stands now.

---

[1] According to the Seattle Medical Surgical Clinic cardiologist's letter dated 9/10/71, Mr. Foy had a right bundle branch block, but that it was inconsequential. The University of Washington cardiologist's letter dated 12/23/70 also recorded that Mr. Foy was born with a right bundle branch block. He further stated that, "This block will not affect his ability nor should it affect significantly his life."

The Pension Board found Mr. Foy to be unqualified for coverage under their system because of his heart condition. However, according to the booklet put out by the Law Enforcement Officer's and Firefighter's Retirement System, Minimum Medical and Health Standards, 1972, Section J.1:c(2), a right bundle branch block, as well as other conductive defects, "occurring as isolated findings are not unfitting when cardiac evaluation reveals no cardiac disease."

ADDENDUM

Randall Foy's fight with, first, the Seattle Fire Department, and then with the Firemen's Pension Board, is not, by any means, an isolated incident. In an article from the *Seattle Times,* written by Lyle Burt, the former Assistant Fire Chief said that it was "difficult and sometimes impossible for small men to do the tasks required of fire fighters." This statement was made in response to criticism aimed at the Public Employees Retirement Board by principally Asian Americans and Chicanos. The retirement board subscribed to a height requirement of 5'8" for firemen. However, Mr. Thomas F. Hanley, Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, in a letter to the Law Enforcement Officer's and Firefighter's Retirement System, stated that the retention of the height requirement would be a "perpetuation of institutionalized racism based on past restrictive hiring policies."[1] After the hearing, the Retirement Board did not adopt the 5'8" height requirement.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That there be a complete investigation of the Firemen's Pension Board's ruling on the case of Randall Foy and other minorities by the State Human Rights Commission.

2. That the Mayor of Seattle and the City Council be called to seek remedy to this problem.

3. That a formal charge be filed through the Governor's Office against the State Firemen's Pension Board for immediate review and remedy. If this route is not possible, court action should be pursued.

4. That the position of Firemen Pension doctor be eliminated and that applicants be given examinations by City Health Department physicians and that applicants be allowed to consult physician specialists of their choice for certain required health aspects.

5. That minorities be represented on the Firemen's Pension Board.

6. That the Firemen's Pension Board policies, regulations, and procedures be reviewed for any disparate treatment.

---

[1] The average height of Asians is estimated at 5'6"; the average height of Chicanos is estimated at 5'7".

PHYSICIANS

Dr. Archimedes Garcia

I graduated in 1958, from the University of Santo Tomas in the Philippines. I had my residency training at the University of the East, and after that I went into private practice in pediatrics and internal medicine for six years in the Philippines. I came to Seattle for the purpose of furthering my studies so that I might go back to my people and help them.

I liked it in Seattle, so I tried to find hospital employment but I was turned down everywhere. I have applied at Ballard, University, Providence, Doctors, Virginia Mason, Cabrini, and Children's Orthopedic Hospitals. They said, "Dr. Garcia, I'm sorry, but you are unable to practice because you don't have a license." Many times I have been told that I cannot do some therapeutic procedure because the hospitals are afraid that they will be sued since I do not have a license. For example, at one hospital, they said that I might do something while on duty and that they might be sued if the patient died.

In order to get a license to practice medicine and into hospital training, you must pass a special examination,[1] designed for foreign medical graduates. The kind of examination they give us is terribly hard. There were only four to five out of thirty-five who passed the examination when I took it. The mortality rate is probably about 80-90%. The examination is discouraging foreign doctors who want to practice in the United States. In that way they are depriving us of applying our training to private practice here. There are around thirty doctors here in Seattle who are not doing the job for which they were trained. There's a doctor who has been a dishwasher for two years; there is one who is a busboy; and several are in janitor work.

I cannot get a job to practice medicine. When I apply for other kinds of jobs, for example, medical technician, I can't get them either even though I am qualified. The common reason given is that we are over-qualified. We have been told that at practically every hospital. For example, immediately after arrival here in Seattle, I filed an application at Group Health Hospital. After eight months I saw in the papers that there was a position open there for a technical assistant. When I went to see about it, they told me that they found somebody more qualified. Later, I found out that he was not even a physician.

---

[1] The Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates Examination (ECFMG) must be passed by foreign medical graduates who are seeking a position as an intern or resident in a hospital in the United States.

At present I am looking for any hospital job. The best thing for me to do now is take any job, even dishwashing. I wouldn't like the job, and that is why I have come before you to ask the Asian American Advisory Council to help us get some job that is at least allied to our profession while we are preparing for the board examination.

I have a family here. I have four kids, and it's hard to stay in a foreign land without anything to do. I'm not ashamed to tell you that I'm on welfare. I am receiving food stamps, and my apartment is subsidized.

There is no way of going back to the Philippines. Where would I go to get the money for our transportation?

In the Philippines we were led to believe that the United States was in great need of foreign physicians. In fact, the Philippines is trying to make a training program for foreign medics so that they can get the same training as U.S. physicians.

There are two suggestions I am offering. One is to notify the American Embassy in the Philippines about the examinations and employment so that other doctors will not have to experience the same thing that we have. The other is to help us get allied medical jobs while we are preparing for the examination.

DR. GARCIA, IS THERE ANYTHING THAT MIGHT BE DIFFERENT IN THE MEDICAL TRAINING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES?

I don't think there is any difference: we are using the same language and the same textbooks. They say that the difficulty in hiring is the language barrier, but all Filipino doctors that took the examination passed the English portion. I don't think language barrier is really the problem.

* * * * *

Dr. Manuel Ramos

I am Dr. Ramos, a graduate from the Philippines. I came to Seattle about one year ago. I had finished my training there but had not practiced. We are having problems in obtaining jobs and passing the examinations. We thought that we could make an appeal to the proper authorities to see if we could obtain work that is at least allied to our profession. One of my appeals is that the government do something regarding this lack of paramedical jobs. For instance, we should be given priority for such jobs as medical technician, therapist, and other allied medical jobs. Another item of our appeal is to request that we be given the privilege of taking the state examination or the examination for foreign doctors.[1] On the basis of the information I have, the doctors who take the regular examinations do better than the doctors who take the foreign doctors examination.

* * * * *

Dr. Vilma Naguit

I am Dr. Naguit. I have been here quite a few years more than these gentlemen have been. I am now working in research at the University of Washington, but I have also experienced the things that the preceding two doctors have.

From my own experience, the European doctors do not have as many problems as Asians. I am acquainted with European physicians who are employed in the Pharmacy Department. I have known of a number of other European doctors who might have come here as fellows from their own universities. Eventually, many of the European doctors are able to work in the clinical aspects of medicine or at least within the medical field.

There was a question regarding differences between the training of medical students in the Philippines and this country. I think that we do not have any differences in the medical training of students. In certain fields there might be a difference because there might be diseases that are more prevalent in this country than in China, Japan, or India, but with regards to the therapeutic approaches, I think all the countries are about the same.

* * * * *

Dr. Charu Mati Rao

I got my M.D. in India and did my postgraduate work at the University of Pennsylvania. I was trained as an obstetrician/gynecologist and pediatrician. Right now I am a general practitioner, emphasizing family planning and natural childbirth. I came to the United States in 1951, and I have lived in the area for about five years - first in Auburn, and for this past year, in Kent.

---

[1] "...The Educational Council for Foreign Medical School Graduates will issue a certificate to a foreign medical graduate who has the requisite educational background and who has achieved a score of at least 75 on the licensure examination administered by the authorities of the State of California." Quote from note received by Philippine Embassy from State Department (February 24, 1972).

In California, a foreign medical graduate may take and pass the California State Medical Examination and receive a license to practice in California. This not permitted in the state of Washington.

My main concern is that although I have my license to practice here I am not allowed to take a patient to the hospital, nor am I allowed to practice in hospitals.

I had tried several times to get my license, but each time I had failed. Finally, a former medical examination reviewer helped me pass the exam by sticking my examination paper in the middle of the pile. You see, there was one man who walked by the people taking the test and marked down the numbers of the tests being taken by people who looked foreign. Because my paper was placed in the middle of the pile, the examiners could not tell that it was my paper. Thus, I passed the exam. The reviewer reviews the test while it is in progress. It is the doctors who actually grade the test.

I wanted to get an investigation started on this matter. I have asked the governor to do something about it, but nothing has happened. Even the reviewer has been kept from saying anything.

From 1961 to 1964, I worked in several hospitals in the Seattle-Tacoma area. They included Providence, Cabrini, Doctors, Northgate, Seattle General, Stimson-Cobb Building, Tacoma General, and Pierce County. I went back East for a while and came back to this area when I got married. When I returned I could find no jobs, not even in the hospitals in which I had worked. Many people and some doctors told me to go back to my own country.

In 1968, KTNT-TV from Tacoma interviewed me about the situation of the foreign doctors. The TV program was never released to the public even though it had been completed. There is also a reporter from a newspaper who has been trying to print my story for about a year, but he cannot get it printed.

My number of patients has been getting less and less. If one of my patients needs to go to a hospital for treatment, and wants me to continue to attend her, then she is told to go to some other hospital. If she has to go to the hospital, then she is told to find another doctor. I cannot treat her. This is really hard for the patient because it means that she has to go to a new doctor whom she may not really know or trust. The hospitals in the Seattle-Tacoma area will not let me go into the hospitals. This has happened to me in about twenty hospitals. I am also not allowed to join the King County Medical Society or the King County Medical Bureau.

One of my patients was going to have a baby. It was a breech baby. I tried to get her into a hospital to make sure that the facilities were available if she needed them. The hospital would not accept her because she was my patient. I finally had to deliver the baby in my office. Both the mother and the baby came out fine, but this type of action by the hospital tends to discourage more patients from coming to see me.

Another example of this type of discrimination occurred when four doctors from Lakewood tried to talk a former patient of mine into writing bad things about me. He had come in to the emergency room one night after being in a bad accident. I had fixed his wounds and injuries. When the doctors asked him to do that, he told them that he had liked my service and that he was well satisfied with it. He said that if it had not been for me, he would not have this beautiful face today. He told them to go jump in the lake.

I have asked the hospitals why they will not let me practice there, but they will not tell me. They say there is something in my records, but I know there is nothing. I was surprised that even the Seattle-Tacoma hospitals where I worked before would not accept me for a job.

Many people and doctors say that foreign doctors should go to smaller towns to practice medicine because that is where the need is. I have some friends who are foreign doctors who have gone to small towns, but they have come back because they did not like the towns. The small towns seem to be even more discriminatory and prejudiced than the bigger cities. Besides, many of the foreign doctors are trained as specialists and staying in a little town is a waste of talent. They cannot practice the type of medicine that they have spent years learning.

Some foreign doctors are forced to work as paramedics, even though their training has been as a physician, because they may not practice medicine on their own. If foreign doctors work like slaves and do not ask for more than just a small portion of what they should get, then they are okay. But, as soon as they begin to stand up for their own rights, then they are bad.

Most hospitals accept government money and therefore cannot really be called private hospitals. If they have government money and get tax exemptions, then they have forfeited their privileges of being a private hospital. They have our tax money. Also, if a patient receives federal assistance for medical expenses, then the patient has the right to go to the doctor and hospital of his choice. But this is not true here. Only certain doctor's patients are allowed to go to certain hospitals. If the doctor is not of the elite, then the patient cannot go to the hospital, and the doctor cannot practice there. For instance, Tacoma Valley General Hospital is a public hospital, but it will not accept my patients.

Most of my patients are white, because most of the people in the area are white, but I also have some American Indian and my kind of Indian patients. Some of them are on welfare. I take care of many of the poor people who are not able to pay for their medical expenses. I have given up thousands of dollars of service to help them. But the numbers of patients coming to see me are going down because I cannot refer them to hospitals even if they need to go.

* * * * *

Dorothy Cordova

The Filipino doctors after having come here are told two things. One is that they could go back to the Philippines. But, that takes money and where would they get the money? The other is that medical education isn't the same here as in the Philippines, that they have to go to school, or that they have to take an examination.

At a meeting of the Filipino doctors last month, one of the doctors who had failed the test said, "You have to take several months off in order to pass the test." Now, if a man has a family to support, what can he do? How would he have time to study? He would worry about how his family was going to live.

While the doctors speak and understand English, one of the problems in the test was the language of the technical terms. It wasn't that they didn't have the technical skills, it was the way in which the test was written.

Filipino doctors are allowed to do extraordinary work when they are hired as technicians. One of the first doctors who got a job as a technician worked for nothing for a week or two, just to prove that he was capable.

A Filipino dentist in a dental clinic found out that some of the people who were working with him were kids out of high school. So he asked, "What are you earning?" He found out that some were earning more than he was with less education and knowledge than he had. He quit. He's doing private work right now.

There are Filipinos working in hospitals who have just not told anybody they are doctors. They accepted jobs as technicians because that was the only way they could get into the hospital. They do have another choice: they could work as busboys or dishwashers. Some of the Filipino doctors are practicing in some little town where no other doctor would go. But there, they are finally doing something they want to do, that they have been trained to do.

There is a movement now toward training paraprofessional medical people because of a need for medical people in this state. Now this really gripes me because you have, on one hand, the need to take people who have no skills and train them to do technical things; and, on the other hand, you have people who have the skills but are not allowed to work.

The largest group of professionals that any country has sent to the United States were the Filipinos, many of whom are medical people. Why didn't someone tell them that this is the way they would be treated here? If they had known, many would not have come or would have been better prepared. But now they are here and they are stuck with it.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Asian American Advisory Council communicate with the American Embassy in the Philippines urging the discouragement of Filipino physicians from emigrating to the United States until discriminatory barriers are removed.

2. That the Philippine Consulate and government be urged to aid in the removal of these barriers.

3. That the state of Washington adopt the California statute allowing foreign medical doctors to take the State medical examination for a Washington license; that the AAAC urge the Governor to aid in this effort.

4. That the ECFMG examination be eliminated and foreign medical graduates be allowed to pass the same examination as U. S. medical graduates.

5. That there be an investigation by the State Human Rights Commission of State procedures in the administration of the ECFMG examination. More specifically, the State should investigate the allegations made by Dr. Mati Rao with regard to racial bias and further, inquire of the Governor as to why there was no response to her letter of complaint.

6. That there be an investigation of medical institutions to see whether they do or do not provide work for foreign medical graduates and to ascertain whether discrimination is practiced and whether Europeans are given preferential treatment.

7. That there be an active recruitment of Asian physicians into governmental medical institutions (including technical positions).

8. That there be an investigation into the procedures and criteria for the granting of hospital privileges to licensed physicians. Further, and specifically, why was not Dr. Mati Rao allowed hospital privileges?

9. That the AAAC communicate with KTNT-TV and request a viewing of the filmed interview with Dr. Mati Rao which was not aired.

POSTAL SERVICE

Masao Tomita

I believe the Postal Service is the second largest employer of Asians in Seattle. I would like to relate some of the experiences I have had in the Postal Service, especially in the area of promotions.

I began working at the post office in March, 1950. That's when the bulk of the Japanese and Chinese entered the Postal Service. My current level of employment is the same as my entry level; I have not had a promotion in 23 years. In the last five years, since 1968, I have applied for at least five promotional positions.[1] Each time I was not selected. In each case I felt that I was equally or more qualified than the person who got the position.

One position I had applied for and had been rejected was in the personnel office. There is not a single minority person in the personnel section. I brought up an official complaint and the case went all the way to Washington, D.C. The final decision of rejection of the complaint was made by the Assistant Postmaster General.

I feel that as a result of my action in bringing a complaint to the Postmaster, I have no more prospects for advancement. The reason I believe this is so is that the last position for which I submitted a bid was given to the Postmaster's godson. Everybody I knew thought I was more qualified, had more education, and more experience. I could tell you of several such cases. Within the Postal Service there aren't many Asians that are willing to step forward and relate their experiences.

I served two years on the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee. To me, the whole EEOC was a farce. All they did was talk a lot. I used to go to the Regional Conferences. When I went to Portland, I came back feeling very, very good. But that was the end of it. Nothing happened; nothing came out of all that rhetoric. That's one of the things about the Post Office Service I'm quite unhappy about.

I am not now on the EEO committee. The way the thing was set up, the members rotated every six months, but I was in there for two years. I guess there was no other Asian willing to step forth and volunteer to be on the committee. There's a lot of people I talked to: the Japanese say, "shikataganai,"[2] or "Why go through all that trouble?" But I am a person and naive enough to think that we should have equal opportunity. The second generation people should pave the way for the future generations so that they will not have to face what the second generation faced in the Post Office Service.

---

[1] Positions applied for: 1) Personnel Assistant (twice); 2) Safety Officer; 3) Office Assistant; 4) EEO Counsellor; and 5) Data Technician.

[2] "Shikataganai": a passive resignation to an undesirable outcome.

WHAT POSITION DO YOU HOLD IN THE POST OFFICE IN SEATTLE NOW?

I have been an accounting clerk since March, 1970.

WOULD YOU TALK ABOUT THE OTHER CASES YOU MENTIONED?

The Post Office advertises a position and people bid for the job. A Chinese fellow who bid for a position was very upset because a woman that he had trained got the position. He came to me and asked, "What can you do about this?" I went to the EEOC officer and we both went to talk to the supervisor, but he did not replace the white woman although he did create another job for the Chinese fellow.

AMONG ASIAN AMERICANS, WHO HOLDS THE HIGHEST POSITION IN THE POST OFFICE HERE?

A Chinese American who is the Assistant Carrier Superintendent in the West Seattle office. He's at grade 11 right now.

HAVE YOU ANY KNOWLEDGE OF THE KIND OF EVALUATION YOU HAVE HAD IN THE TIME YOU'VE BEEN THERE?

Yes, when I brought the official complaint. The evaluation is graded on the basis of points. I asked the people how many points I had but I didn't get a breakdown until after I had a four-hour hearing with the Civil Service Commission. At the regional office I asked for a summation of my credit points. Their estimate of all my points added up to more than what I had received officially.

THE REGIONAL OFFICE ESTIMATE WAS HIGHER THAN WHAT YOU ACTUALLY RECEIVED?

They had not included my education points because I didn't write it on my application since my personnel folder had all my education background. But, they said, "Oh, we don't look at your personnel folder."

HAVE YOU PERSONALLY TRAINED INDIVIDUALS WHO THEN WERE PROMOTED ABOVE YOU?

Yes, occasionally I have. I trained one woman in the position of Postal Data Technician. At that time I was the Acting Supervisor of that floor for one year, so I had to be the teacher. I never received training. I had to learn it by myself.

YOU REFERRED TO THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE ON WHICH YOU SERVED FOR TWO YEARS. WHAT DID YOU DO?

We had to write the whole plan of action. We interviewed people who were knowledgeable about discrimination and wrote up a plan of action.

WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS ON PROMOTION? IS THERE A PERSONNEL BOARD THAT MAKES THE RECOMMENDATIONS?

Yes, there is a personnel board, but there again, there isn't a single minority on that.

HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE ON THE BOARD?

There are two boards - the Promotional Board and the Interim Board. When you come to an interview, they select most of the people from the personnel section. There would be four different people every time.

IS THERE ANYTHING IN YOUR RECORD THAT MIGHT BE INTERPRETED AS BEING POOR PERFORMANCE AND MAY ACCOUNT FOR YOUR NOT BEING PROMOTED?

I was one of the first recipients of the superior performance award. I have received awards and training certificates and passed tests.[1]

DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION ON THE TURNOVER OF ASIANS AS COMPARED TO WHITES IN YOUR PARTICULAR DEPARTMENT?

No, I don't have access to that kind of record. There's only about 12 people in our section and some have service of maybe 20 years or more. So there's not much of a turnover there.

HOW MANY ASIANS HAVE BEEN LEFT AT ENTRY LEVEL POSITIONS AND HOW MANY HAVE BEEN PROMOTED AS COMPARED TO THE CAUCASIANS?

---

[1] 1) Superior performance award ($50), August, 1961; 2) Suggestion award ($30), November, 1970; 3) Passed electro-mechanical test, February, 1963; 4) Passed Supervisor test, October, 1968; 5) Certificate of Postal Management Development, September, 1968.

I don't have that information. If you write to the EEO officers they may give you the figures.

YOU'VE BEEN WORKING AT THE POST OFFICE FOR 23 YEARS. DO YOU THINK YOU ARE LAGGING BEHIND IN WAGES AS COMPARED TO THE WHITES??

No. We have set increases throughout 12 different steps. It doesn't make any difference what job you have, you get your 12 raises.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Asian American Advisory Council request the Postal Service's EEOC plan of action for review and obtain information with regards to problems mentioned in the testimony. The information desired would be data on the numbers of minorities on the work force, the positions held, their lengths of service, the number of promotions, etc. If review of the plan of action and statistical data bear out the testimony, the AAAC should pursue vigorous attempts at rectification, including a possible class action suit for disparate treatment of Asians.

2. That minority representatives be placed in the Personnel section to interview applicants or bidders and on Promotion and Interim Boards.

ALASKAN SALMON CANNERIES

Nemesio Domingo

I am an elected member of the Board of the International Longshoreman's Union, Local 37, which represents the Filipinos in Alaska. I have been a union delegate since 1966 and have been in canneries for five seasons. I have been blacklisted since 1970 for unspecified reasons. I would like to break up my presentation in three parts: one is treatment of Filipinos in the canneries; two, the Filipinos and other minorities in the pecking order; and three, my own experience in being brownlisted from canneries.

The general treatment of Filipinos can be summarized as segregated living, preferential treatment and arbitrary rules. In terms of segregated living, the bunkhouses are a good example. Most Filipinos' bunkhouses are barracks. It's a long building with bunks stretched across the room. In the year I was blacklisted in 1970, the State said that this was a health hazard. We can contrast this with the white man's bunkhouses in which the rooms have walls. There are no more than four people in those rooms. Fraternization between the white man and the Filipinos is discouraged. The best example is in Alitak where a relative of the superintendent was told not to fraternize with the Filipinos. Another example of our living condition is that the white man has drawers and they have closets; since the Filipinos do not have similar bunkhouses, in order to store their clothes they have to use boxes that they stick underneath their beds. As for closets, we use nails to hang up our clothes. And the white man has better drying facilities; this is important because most Filipinos are involved in the fish house, cleaning fish, and need these facilities because their clothes are the ones that get wet, and one of the most uncomfortable feelings is to work in soggy, wet clothes.

In preferential treatment, I would like to cite some examples. One is the construction policy in Alaska. There are canneries in varying states of decay and there is continuous construction. When the bunkhouses are first constructed the new bunkhouses are given to the white man, then the Filipinos move into the bunkhouses that the white man has vacated, and then the old bunkhouse that we had is torn down. This is the general policy that is followed in almost all canneries. It is a very rare instance where the management will construct the Filipino bunkhouse first.

Another example of preferential treatment is the drinking policy on the Fourth of July. For some reason, management thinks that Filipinos cannot hold their liquor. In the canneries I have been in, two cans of beer apiece go to the Filipinos while the white man always receives close to one case.

Another example is the position of bull cook. A bull cook is defined as the person who cleans up the area, what you might call a janitor. In the white man's bunkhouse they have, specifically, a bull cook to clean out the bunkhouses, and change their sheets, and that is all this man does. In my experience in Alitak and Uganik Bay, our bull cook was also responsible for helping in the kitchen. In some instances even the kitchen crew was used as bull cook. This may not seem like a big thing, but consider that the people who were in charge of cleaning the bathroom and cleaning out the area were also preparing our food, and this is something that doesn't happen with the white man. So here we have somebody cleaning our toilets and preparing our food.

The fourth example is the linen policy. The white man, with his bull cook, is provided with clean sheets once a week. Supposedly, we have the same privilege but we have never been so lucky. We wind up having to wash our own linen and in a busy season where you are working three days straight, and you may be lucky if you get six hours sleep in a period of three days. If you stretch it out to a week, you can imagine that by the end of that week you aren't going to be full of energy to wash your linen. Sometimes if the season gets busy you may go through the whole season without clean linens.

The fifth example is the kitchen facilities. They are different between the white man's and our bunkhouses. You will find that the white man's is more modernized than ours. In some instances they have dishwashers - automatic dishwashers. They have other facilities which are not available in our mess halls.

The sixth example is the baggage searches. In our contract it says that management has a right to search our baggage, and even have the right to search our rooms - supposedly because these are private properties of the management. But the baggage search policy is very discriminatory because the Filipinos are the ones who get searched; they feel that Filipinos are the ones that are liquor running, and liquor running in Alaska is very lucrative because you can sell at $3/fifth for about $40 a bottle at the end of the season. I have yet to see the same policy (of baggage search) applied to the white man. It is obvious that there are not too many Filipinos that are involved in it, and that liquor is coming from somewhere and not just coming from the Filipinos.

A seventh example - one more example of this baggage search, is the canned salmon. Every year there are cans that are missing and the blame for those missing cans always go to the Filipinos. Their baggage is searched.

An eighth example would be hair length. Filipinos wearing long hair are automatically subject to all sorts of harassment from management. For some reason wearing your hair long for a Filipino is not right, whereas a white person wearing long hair is not harassed at all.

A ninth example is bathroom facilities. There is quite a bit of difference between the white man's bathroom facilities and ours. You'll find in most of our bathroom facilities that most of the toilets don't work, they don't flush. As for our washing machines, we usually get the hand-downs from the white man's bunkhouse to wash our clothes. One reason I feel that there is a big difference between the bathroom facilities is the fact that the people that are in charge of funding are all white men and so since they have to use their own facilities, they make sure that those facilities work; whereas, they only give us token consideration in terms of our bathroom facilities.

The second area that I'd like to talk about is the pecking order in Alaska. There are six crews in Alaska, each designated with certain responsibilities. One is management - all white. In my five seasons in Alaska I saw only one token Asian assistant bookkeeper. Within management, would also be included the foreign Japanese who come over to help let contracts on salmon roe and cold storage salmon. The second crew is the machinist crew, which is all white - the only exception I saw was one native Alaskan carpenter. And then you have the beach gang which is sometimes mixed. The beach gang is primarily a white group who do most of the jobs that the Filipinos are not supposed to be doing. They try to distinguish their responsibilities from ours. The only way to describe their job is that they have long hours and one of the most lucrative jobs that the Filipinos once had - working in the warehouse and longshoring. So jobs that were once the Filipinos' have now been taken over by the beach gang crew, which is predominantly white. Then you have the Filipino crew which does the shit work in the cannery. They are the ones that clean the fish, handle the fish; they are the ones that sweep up the place, clean up the place, paint, just about any shit thing you can think of. Then you have the native Alaskans who are used as a source of emergency labor. For instance, if there is a prime run on a cannery of salmon, rather than bring up additional Filipinos they hire native Alaskans. Native Alaskans are lucky in the sense that they don't have contracts and when the management gets shitty about things they can leave; whereas we have to stay. And then you have the women who, I feel, are quickly taking the Filipino's place as the new nigger in Alaska. The reason that I call them this is the fact that much of the shit work that we are doing is now being taken up by these women, and the reason for this is that women cannot have contracts. They work by the hour, where we are contracted for a certain length of months.

Within this pecking order there are certain attitudes that develop. Some of these attitudes is what I call the "Boy" attitude. This is the white man looking at the Filipino, the little brown boys that help them take care of the things that have to be done, such as cleaning the bunkhouse or cutting the grass in front of their bunkhouses. Another attitude that I think management has is that Filipinos are lazy. An example of this is that within a season there is not always continuous work and there are lags within the period of runs. Most management thinks when he sees these Filipinos not doing any work, it just supports the feeling that these Filipinos are just plain lazy. Now the white man has an interesting way of getting around this. What they can do is take apart their machine and oil it - and they do this day after day, and they feel like they are doing something constructive; whereas the Filipinos do a lot of shit work.

For example, at Alitak when there was an extremely poor run, we went down to the beach, and we cleaned up the beach. This particular cannery during the winter was used as a king crab cannery, so there was a lot of trash on the beach that was washed up. We would go down to break up the beach and throw these shells into the water during the low tide and when high tide came it would wash it up again. So the next day, we went back and did the same, go down and clean up the beach, throw it in the water, and the next day, we did the same thing all over again. We would do such things in the warehouse, too. There were little boxes which we would shift from one end of the cannery down to the other end, and then we would be responsible for counting those boxes. This kind of meaningless work - I can go on and on with this. Another example, again, cutting grass. There is no reason to cut grass simply because it just grows wild.

Another attitude had to do with the speed of production. When I complained to the superintendent of Alitak about the speed-up of production, he said, "Well I don't understand why you Filipinos have this grudge of speed-up of production because I've seen pictures of Asians in Asia carrying 200 pound packs on their backs on loading docks." That was his attitude toward us. And I believe that this attitude is also prevalent in other canneries which may not be as blatant and racist as the superintendent's. We were half a crew doing the work of a full crew, and this particular cannery prided itself in having produced the most cans with the least number of people.

White women are recruited from the universities, colleges, and schools, and are brought up there simply because there are certain jobs - let's just take one specific cannery with two and a half lines - you need a crew of approximately 70 people. Now if you were to hire women you wouldn't have to hire as many Filipinos and have to pay a 2-month contract. These women work only by the hours. There was one woman who was in Uganik who was up there for three months who came back with $300. There is no way in our contract that you can get a Filipino and only pay him $300 for 3 months' work. They would be getting close to $1500. So there is the difference there. The Filipinos are not considered good enough for the women. One incident was reported to me where a Filipino was threatened and almost physically hurt by the superintendent who claimed that this one Filipino brother was getting too friendly with this one particular girl who happened to be a relative of his.

The last item in this section that I would like to talk about is that within this pecking order, Filipinos are used against the advancement of other people - of other minorities that work in the canneries. The women are beginning to get more and more of the shit jobs that the Filipinos had and I gave you that three month example where the one woman worked three months and only came home with $300. The management continuously points out that they are going to use more and more women and what this does is infuriate more of the old-timers seeing that their jobs are threatened. There has really been no attempt to bring these two groups together into one union. I have only heard of one instance where the company did encourage the union to incorporate these women.

The last item I would like to talk about is being brownlisted at a cannery. My personal experience occurred at Uganik when a new operation was introduced into the cannery. There are now basically three operations within the salmon cannery: one is the canning of salmon itself, the second is the processing of fish eggs - and most of these fish eggs go back to Japan. The third operation which was fairly new in this particular cannery had to do with cold storage. This was to take the whole fish and freeze them, and then ship the frozen fish to Japan. In this operation, I felt that I was hired to do one operation on the cold storage. The canning process is overtime. Processing the eggs is covered by another contract, and if you are in that particular process then anything outside that is overtime. This new operation of cold storage was done in the past by the white people in other canneries, and this was covered by another contract. My gripe was that in that particular season, 1970, we were running only half crew; and what was happening to me was that not only was I supposed to help in the cold storage but afterwards I was supposed to go and help in the other operations. I said that you cannot do this unless you pay me overtime. The company disagreed and said you were hired there to do any kind of work that they felt was necessary to run that cannery. And it was this disagreement that caused my termination. At that time I did not make any stink at the cannery except to bring about a meeting at the cannery at which the superintendent showed up. This is the background of my brownlisting, the major cause being the disagreement over cold storage work.

But there were other incidents which happened to other people. I was a union delegate in 1969. Most of the men did come to me for some kind of assistance. For instance, when they got their pay check, they would ask me to look over their pay check; when there was a discrepancy they insisted that I go to the office and straighten it out because the union delegate was supposed to do that. In cases where people had to leave for particular reasons, they again asked me to represent them since the union delegate was supposed to do that. And there were good reasons why many did not trust the union delegates. If the management finds someone who starts sticking up for the rights of Filipino workers, their stay will be particularly short. At present there is no procedure to protect us from brownlisting. This is because the reasons the cannery can give for brownlisting are very vague in their guidelines. In the letter of termination that was given to me, the reason for termination was an "unsatisfactory attitude." I found out that this was the same standard form for everyone brownlisted in Alaska - "unsatisfactory attitude." In the hearing that followed, neither the foreman nor the superintendent could give specific reasons why I was brownlisted. The fact is that they needed scapegoats. There were several people, not only within the Filipino crew, but in the other crews, that were beginning to stand up for more and more of their rights. In each of these crews they would selectively take people out and brownlist them as examples. That's to show that if you step out of line you won't be at the cannery the following year. I was not allowed to return to that cannery in 1971.

DOES YOUR UNION NOW HAVE ANY POWER AT ALL IN NEGOTIATING SUCH THINGS AS LIVING CONDITIONS?

Right now we are limited to just the economic rights - to get some decent wages. The same demands for better living conditions that I presented to the union, were the same ones that were presented 30 years ago, and very few of them have ever been implemented. It just shows you that right now we have such a hard time just getting decent wages. Two years ago we finally got a pension plan. Many of these people have been working in the canneries for 30 years and those that retired a year before could not get any kind of a pension plan and the only reason we got it was because a staff negotiator from San Francisco (I.L.W.U.) came up here and helped negotiate a contract. We have been trying to get an overtime and a penalty time for our union. It was only two years ago that the State passed a law that allowed a penalty time and an overtime rate. When we try to find out why the union is so weak, we find that whatever improvements we have had was through some outside help. It is discouraging that every year that goes by, we see more and more canneries using women and canneries being modernized so that fewer and fewer people from our unions go to Alaska.

HAS THE UNION CONTRACTED LABORERS FOR THE ENTIRE CANNING LINE, OR ARE THERE WOMEN IN THERE TOO?

The women are now working at the patching table. When cans are filled, the machine doesn't always fill the cans to its limits, and the women put pieces of salmon in to make it come out to a pound or a half pound. I want to give one other example. I mentioned six crews. The most important crew from which the Filipinos have been excluded is the machinists crew. I have yet to see any Filipino being recruited for these jobs. The journeyman's position for those jobs are always reserved for those people who are close friends of the superintendent. One year his son, who was only 14 or 15 years old, joined the machinists.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission investigate the disparate treatment, as testified, given the Filipinos in Alaska salmon canneries.

2. That the salmon canning industry be required to develop and implement affirmative action programs to ameliorate the conditions described.

3. That the Asian American Advisory Council review with the cannery workers' union possible strategies for effecting increased benefits.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Michael Castillano

Employment Services

Difficulties with staff employment exist at the University. In the last two years, they hired an employment supervisor or evaluator; initially, this person was black. Later, they hired a Chicano, and then an Indian. They disregarded completely the notion of an Asian in that position. In the meantime large numbers of Filipino immigrants have been coming to the University for employment. Although they have come with credentials acquired in the Philippines and may have acquired permanent resident status, they have been discriminated against because of the priorities of the system.

While language has been cited as a barrier, I believe that it is a dead issue, particularly in the Health Sciences. There are many foreign doctors employed there from European countries and they are also difficult to understand. The injustice of the thing is that most of the Filipino people are qualified in certain areas - Ph.D.'s, M.D.'s, and the like - but are generally hired only in the technical areas. Then they are given virtually no opportunity to progress within the department.

Last year (January, 1972), I made a study of the 133 Filipino employees at the University, taking a sample of 44 employees. Their jobs varied from the service-oriented positions up to laboratory technicians. Of those 44 employees surveyed, the average education acquired in the Philippines and the United States was 15.6 years, yet the average salary was only $7,040, with an average employment length of 4.5 years. Of those 44 employees, 25 had at least a college education, and 10 had a Masters degree or better.

A few of the employees who are working there want to further their education, but because of their work load, they are not given the opportunity to take University courses.[1] In the Dental School, there is a dentist with 13 years of practice from the University of the Philippines. She's an orthodontist and has been there for two years, but is only getting $432. Her job title is "Dental Assistant," but she's actually making the plates.

Educational Services

At the University, there is not only a large increase in the number of Filipino immigrants, but also of Chinese. The Linguistics Department at the University has not been able to come up with a course in English as a Second Language to help these students. Therefore, we are forced to use the ESL Program in the community to supplement the curriculum where the University has been delinquent. The University wants to run the program with language majors who are not bilingual, but who are attempting to teach Asian immigrants the straight, book-learning kind of English. The jargon that is so important for survival is left out in that kind of teaching. We are working together with a couple of people in the English Department, but the people there that are willing to work are teaching assistants. At this time, we have about 40 students that we've identified as having difficulty in school because of language problems. It's about a 50-50 split between Filipino and Chinese students.

---

[1] According to University regulations, employees who have been employed at the University of Washington for six months may take 6 credits of classes per quarter, free of charge.

Another area of concern is how the Asian American Studies Program is going. I guess it's the critical mass that the UW responds to, and we, as Asians, haven't jumped up and down screaming. Therefore, we're getting the crumbs in terms of what we are allocated from the University.[1] It's getting better, but the kinds of things that we have to do, and the struggle we have to get the faculty to change some of their thinking are discouraging.

Two years ago, we got a list of graduate students attending the University. The list had about 150 "apparent" Asian Americans. After we checked the list, we found that about 125 of the 150 were foreign students; they weren't Asian Americans.[2] Further, about 15 of that number had already graduated. As Asians, we get in at the undergraduate level and complete the first four years, but up until last year there were only about 25 Asian Americans in the Graduate School. I think that this year the figure will be better than that.[3] Many of the brothers and sisters are sitting there thinking, "Well, that's not too bad." But, when they try to get in anywhere besides the social sciences - like Urban Planning, Medical School, or Law School - they'll find out how difficult it is to be admitted.

---

[1] During the academic year 1971-1972, the Asian American Studies Program operated on a budget of $0 but was supplied secretarial aid, materials, and research funds. In 1972-1973, the operating budget was approximately $5000.

[2] According to Juan Juarez, Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School, many of the graduate departments include foreign students in their Affirmative Action reports. This gives the false impression that there are many American minorities in the departments.

[3] In Autumn 1972, there were 275 "Oriental" graduate students at the University of Washington. Of these, 209 were foreign graduate students leaving a balance of 66 Asian Americans. These 66 comprised 1.0% of the total number of graduate students (6474) registered that quarter. -- Appendix N, Policy Statement, Asian and Poverty Division of Office of Minority Affairs, May 4, 1973.

In the Office of Minority Affairs, the Asian Division was the last one added. Then the school decided that we had left out the white folks, so we now have Asian students, together with the poor, all the immigrants, and all the ex-felons. It's not that I am in favor of being exclusionary, but it's difficult to have to deal with all the different groups.[1] When the Office of Minority Affairs is working so hard to maintain a posture of pluralism, the other departments raise hell about our not having whites in our office. But, in their departments you don't see any minorities.[2]

Right now I'm with the Resident Release Program.[3] The ones that are eligible for the program are short-timers with less than a year to serve. Whites are the only ones being released into the program. There are a number of Asians in Walla Walla, Monroe, and McNeil Island, but there hasn't been one Asian released. They are not aware of the program. There is really a very low percentage of blacks in the program, about 10%. Perhaps the program is relatively new, but you can see a pattern being established already.

---

[1] According to a preliminary study being conducted by Mr. Juarez, the Office of Minority Affairs has worked with 116 Asians since 1968. This represents 16% of the total number of students who have been serviced. The blacks represent 65%, Chicanos 12%, and the American Indians 5% of the total. The latter three groups have their own ethnic division offices, while the Asian Division, handling the second largest ethnic group, must disburse its services to the others mentioned as well.

[2] In a study conducted by the Office of Minority Affairs in 1970, the staff found that the white students who were in the program did not feel that they needed a special white counselor. Presently, the staff of the Asian and Proverty Student Division consists of seven Asians.

[3] The Resident Release Program is a program which allows for certain residents of prisons to attend college. The program began in 1971 under the auspices of the Office of Minority Affairs and a student group, Cons Unlimited.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Asian American Studies Program at the University of Washington be allocated appropriate financing in its budget to mount a greater educational and research thrust.

2. That the Asian Division in the Office of Minority Affairs deal strictly with Asian problems so that staff efforts will not be diluted by other functions.

3. That the University require graduate departments to separate out foreign Asian students from Asian American students in their affirmative action reports.

4. That the Linguistics Department expand and modify its curriculum for Asian foreign students to include the teaching of English as a Second Language by utilizing bilingual teachers who may be from the Asian community.

5. That the University provide information on whether the Health Sciences has practiced disparate treatment in the employment of foreign doctors, by detailing occupations and salaries, applications made and rejected, reasons for rejection, etc.

6. That the University compile statistical information on Asian American students to ascertain their specific fields of study according to ethnic groupings and student class rank.

COLLEGES AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Cesar DeGracia

I received a B.A. and a B.S. in education in 1951 and 1952, my M.A. in English in 1959 - all from the University of Santo Tomás in Manila. I got my M.A. in speech from the University of Washington in 1965. In 1971, I got my Administrator's credentials which included internships at Seattle University and Franklin High School. I have taught school for a total of fourteen years: six years in high school in the Philippines, one year in college in the Philippines, seven years in the U.S. in high schools. I have been teaching English at Renton High School for seven years. I am now in my third year as a part-time teacher at Seattle Central Community College, where I taught freshman and sophomore English and the Fundamentals of English for juniors and seniors, and am now teaching Reading Development for all levels.

In July of last year, I applied for a full-time teaching job at Seattle Central Community College. The chairman of the Humanities Department encouraged me to apply for two available positions - one was instructor in the adult high school of the college[1] and the other was instructor in communication skills.[2] I applied for both positions, knowing that I was qualified for both. I told the chairman that I would be willing to accept either one of the positions, but that I preferred the communication skills position.

The Board interviewed me a month later. It took a long time to schedule the interview and it was a last minute interview. I thought the interview was to be for communication skills position, but after the interview, the Board of Interviewers said that the interview was for both positions.

I didn't meet with the committee again. It was a committee of teachers that interviewed me. The chairman had told the group that I was well qualified as a teacher and that I would be teaching part time in the college. The interview was unusual because only two people really questioned me. The four women just listened to my qualifications. The question the men asked were not really to find out whether I was knowledgeable in my field; they were asking hypothetical questions. The whole interview took about 15 minutes.

---

[1] Job description: Emphasis on remedial college-exploratory and adult-high school-level reading, language, composition, and literature for adults of varying ages and nationalities; demonstrated ability in working with students of limited backgrounds; experience in high school teaching.

[2] Job description: Classes in written and oral communications in vocational-technical program. Masters degree in English preferred. Must be eligible for or currently holding a vocational teaching certificate on communications. This involves, in addition to the training requirements, practical experience in business or industry.

DID ANY OF THE PEOPLE ASK YOU TO REPEAT THINGS DURING THE INTERVIEW BECAUSE OF YOUR ACCENT?

No. I have been teaching English for six years. I am a speech major and have been teaching in college for two years. If they had any objections to my accent, or any deficiency, they should have said something before.

I waited for the results of the interview. Just before classes started at Franklin High School they notified me that I was not one of those recommended to the Dean of Instruction.[1] I asked the chairman, "Why was I not one of the top three when you stated that I was one of the most qualified?"

He had told me earlier, "Of all the applicants, you are the most versatile; you have a speech major, a M.A. in speech, and a M.A. in English. You could handle many courses."

I thought I was a victim of discrimination, so I went one afternoon to the State Human Rights Commission. I gave them the facts and they thought I had a good case. Later, the Human Rights Commission told me that I didn't have a case of discrimination because the two persons that were selected had comparable qualifications. I was not informed about whether they had a Masters or a Ph.D. or how many years of teaching experience they had.[2]

I can't see how anyone could be better qualified because very few people have more than one Masters for any position. I don't see any reason why they should say I'm over-qualified because I'm teaching in high school and the high school has not considered me over-qualified. That I was not one of the finalists for the position in the Adult Education High School burns me up because I could have handled it even with a Masters degree.

---

[1] It is customary to recommend the top three candidates to the Dean of Instruction.

[2] According to the State Human Rights Commission report, "though Mr. DeGracia was not among the top six applicants, he was a qualified minority."

* * * * *

Paula Frial

I received my B.A. in Education in the Philippines and had four years of teaching experience there. I came to the United States and earned my Masters in Physical Education at the University of Oregon, where I was a teaching assistant. I taught school for one year in Wisconsin, after which I went to the University of Iowa for my Ph.D. I also worked there as a research assistant. I had an offer to teach at Grinnel College, a prestigious school, like Whitman College here in Washington. By July, 1963, I had finished my courses at Iowa, but was still working on my dissertation. I married and came to Seattle.

Altogether I have six years of teaching experience - three years at college level and three years at high school, plus two and a half years of research experience at the college level. I applied for teaching jobs in the Seattle Public Schools in 1963, 1964, and 1965, but nothing came of my applications. I received my Ph.D. in 1965 and in 1966 I had decided to stay home, rather than seek employment.

In the past two years, however, I have been looking for either a teaching position or a position in the area of research, evaluation and planning. I would like to tell you about three jobs that I applied for.

The first position was that of an evaluation intern. This was in 1971. The job was to help evaluate a Head Start program and an enrichment program. I had had such experience with these types of programs: I was the head teacher at a day nursery, which included many low-income families, and my children attend a private school - Seattle Country Day School. The job description indicated an M.A. was desirable but not necessary. I did not get the job, but was informed through a letter that the school system would like to keep my name on file for consideration of future positions in the Planning and Evaluation Department.

In October, 1972, I applied for a job as assistant in Health, Physical and Recreation Education to the Seattle School District. This job was to assist the specialist in coordinating city-wide programs and facilities in Health Education in grades K-12 and in providing a liaison function with girls' physical education and athletics. The requirements for this administrative job included a valid Washington State Teacher's Certificate, an M.A. in Education, and four years teaching experience. Minorities were encouraged to apply for the position. I did not get this job.

In both cases, I was not even interviewed.

The third job was at the University of Washington. Because I have a Ph.D., I am qualified to teach at the university level. In January, 1973, there was an opening for a Statistician II in

Sports Medicine, on a study of problems of skiers. The interviewer asked me if knew how to ski. I said, yes, that this was my first year as a skier. During the interview, the interviewer said the ski experience was preferred, but not required. Later, however, that was given as the reason for rejection. He said that I did not ski well enough for the position. This was in contradiction to what had been told to me previously. It's difficult to understand why a statistician position requires good skiing ability.

There are other examples of such experiences in my job hunting, but, these are my main complaints. In reading the requirements for the job, there is already a self-screening process. From past experience, often the actual work of the job does not really require all what the requirements ask for. In all these jobs that I applied for, I know very well that I am qualified for them, but I never got them.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That there be a review of affirmative action programs at Seattle Central Community College and the Seattle School District.

2. That there be a review of profile of Asian employment at Seattle Central Community College and the Seattle School District.

3. That the State Human Rights Commission provide the Asian American Advisory Council with complete information on their review of Mr. DeGracia's cases to determine the factors contributing to the "no probable cause" conclusion. If this is unsatisfactory, the AAAC should ask for a re-investigation of Mr. DeGracia's complaint.

4. That Seattle Central Community College be requested to include non-white faculty on the interviewing team.

INDUSTRY

Ricardo Farinas

I was born in the Philippines and came here to school in 1952. The fact that I was born in the Philippines and have an accent, I believe, has hampered acceptance into American society. In 1968 I became an officer in the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

When I first came here in 1952, I started school at the University of Washington. I came as a graduate student having finished college in the Philippines. I had been a school teacher there in elementary and high schools. Before I began my studies at the University I was confronted with the big problem of how to finance my studies. I took jobs like mowing lawns, washing windows, and so on. I was not the only one with this problem. While going to the University I always had a part-time job - washing dishes for the student coop houses, and being paid 80¢ an hour. This work was the only kind of job that I could get.

I graduated in 1954 with a Bachelors degree in Business Administration. My first employment opportunity was with the National Bank of Commerce; there were positions open in the foreign exchange department. This job was called to my attention by the Philippine Consulate and they requested an interview for me. I was interviewed by Personnel, and I sensed that I didn't have a chance during the interview. The interviewer couldn't look me straight in the face, and I felt he wasn't sincere. He could hardly wait for me to finish so I could get out of his office. That was the first time in Seattle that I really felt discriminated against.

In search of a job in 1955, I walked from Smith Tower to East Marginal Way to get to Isaacson Steel Company. Fortunately, one of the superintendents there at the time was a white man who, during his younger days, had been a neighbor to a Filipino family. He was an orphan and the Filipinos had helped take care of him. So I started working for Isaacson Steel Company in 1955. At first I worked in the office. Then I requested the transfer because I wasn't given any chance for promotion or for a pay increase.

So I became a helper or a rigger in the steel yard at Isaacson. Then, a year and a half or two later, I became a crane operator. My job was to supervise loading and unloading and dispatching of steel and building materials. I had this job for 8½ to 9 years. It was a good job. There wasn't any promotion except for the increment pay and fringe benefits.

During my time as lead man in the steel yard, there were a number of people that were assigned to my shop, or to my department. After 6 months to a year of being with me, learning the routine of the job, these people were soon assigned to some other kind of job. I can remember a high school graduate who was pulled out from the steel yard, put into apprenticeship training, and a year later became an assemblyman making 50-60¢ an hour more than my salary.

This kind of thing happened many times. There were a lot of youngsters - mostly high school graduates that came to the steel yards and were offered promotional opportunities. But I would never progress, so I confronted the office manager. I requested that I be put on another assignment, expecially in the office. They couldn't deny me the opportunity because I knew there was a vacancy. They said that I didn't have experience in this line of work, that they could offer less pay, and that six months or a year later, adjustments for a proper rating could be made. The offer I was given at the time was $100 less than my shop pay. I didn't accept the position. After that, a white fellow who had graduated from high school with some bookkeeping background in school was given the job with full pay.

I left Isaacson, not necessarily because I did not like the job, nor necessarily because I wasn't given the promotional opportunity, but because I developed a skin allergy due to the steel. The foreign dust that came along with the box cars of steel had given me some skin irritation all the time, and I had gone through a lot of medication and skin specialists. I had to quit and went to work at the Boeing Company.

At Boeing I had to start all over again as a warehouseman. This was in 1966. However, the skin irritation just followed me. I was still dealing with the same problem. I was able to get a transfer to East Field where I worked in the environmental control area where everything was dust free. It was still warehouse work but I worked with different products or items such as diodes, resistors, capacitors, which needed to be dust free. I worked there almost four years until 1968, when I came to the E.E.O.C. office.

CAN YOU SAY SOMETHING ABOUT DISCRIMINATION AT BOEING?

One of the most discriminatory experiences I had at Boeing was in terms of promotion or assignment of jobs. The fact that you are a senior employee doesn't necessarily mean that you automatically get the promotion or assignment to a better job. When the supervisors noted that there was going to be an opening for higher position, they would assign a minority to a differert kind of job, or transfer him to another department, temporarily. This is legitimate. They deter you from getting that position. Then a white man would be gradually trained for that position so that when the minority came back from temporary assignment, that white person would be fully trained. You don't have a chance to get that position regardless of how senior you are over him, regardless of qualifications and capability.

DURING THE THREE OR FOUR YEARS YOU WERE AT BOEING, DID YOU GET ANY PROMOTION?

No, only grade increases which everybody received.

COULD YOU TELL ME OF OTHER INSTANCES OF UNEQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES?

I want to mention the Yakima Furniture Company where the majority of the production workers are Filipinos. I was informed by my father and uncle who are working there that they are only getting paid a starting salary. Whites are given a $2.50 starting salary, but Filipinos are paid $1.85 for doing exactly the same kind of work. As a matter of fact, the Filipinos put out more than the white person next to them.

WHAT CAN THE E.E.O.C. DO TO RECTIFY THIS KIND OF INEQUITY?

We can take complaints from these people. I want to mention that an organization now can file a complaint on behalf of an aggrieved party who has been discriminated against in terms of employment or promotion, or increase in pay, and so on.

WHY CAN'T THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BE THE ADVOCATE?

There has to be a person who has to stand right up and declare himself aggrieved upon. In order for us to act against an individual employer, there must be a complainer. An association or a body, like the JACL, the Filipino Community, can file a complaint on behalf of the person.

GENERAL

Lisa Mocorro

(Ms. Mocorro's testimony centered around the employment difficulties of the Asians, especially the Filipinos, who came in the Employment Opportunity Center (EOC), where she is employed. The following are examples of the complaints and situations which she has encountered).

1. We were going to refer a Filipino doctor for a position as a surgical technician at Virginia Mason Hospital. He is qualified for that position. However, Virginia Mason indicated past problems with Filipino doctors who were employed there, as were surgical technicians. They supposedly weren't following orders in the operating room. Now, the hospital has made it a practice not to hire any Filipino doctors.

2. We have talked to the personnel people at Providence Hospital about a case concerning a Filipino man who had worked in California as a laboratory technician. Right now he's working at Providence as a janitor. We told them that he had technical qualifications, that he's had experience in the Philippines, and four months experience in California where he's registered. When we asked if Providence could employ him in some kind of position in the labs, they said, "Well, we can't because he's not registered in Washington." Then we said, "Since you are training people to be lab technicians, why couldn't he be first in line behind these people when a position opens?"

3. We've had problems with Seattle First National Bank, especially with a particular personnel officer. We wanted to fill a management trainee position with an Asian but the personnel officer seemed to want a "super Asian." We screened all applicants before referral to the bank for an interview. One applicant was pretty well qualified for the management trainee position. I advised him before the interview that he should not be reticent about his capabilities. He didn't get the job. After that we sent two more Asian applicants, but they didn't get the job, either.

Dina Valentine

Ms. Valentine's testimony focused on her employment at Boeing. There, she felt that other individuals employed by Boeing, many of whom she had trained previously, were given an opportunity to be trained for advancement. Such opportunities were not provided for her or other Asians.

She also stressed the need to recognize Asians as a minority and as rightful recipients of aid and opportunities received by minority groups under such laws as the Equal Opportunities Act.

HOUSING

Vic Bacho

To begin with - I still remember the time in California, I was working in a sawmill, where they paid 35¢ an hour for doing the same kind of work. I can still remember when I was arrested in Sacramento. While I was talking to another Filipino on the sidewalk, a police officer went through on his beat, you know, kicked me on my behind for whatever reason he had in his mind. Those were the days, then, of the race riots.

THIS WAS BEFORE THE WAR?

Yes. After I got out of the service, I was going back and forth between Seattle, Washington and California. My brother and sister-in-law lived in Seattle and we used to go to Alaska. In 1965, my brother asked me to come to Seattle and stay with him at his house. I thought that this would be a good change, that things might be better if I came to Seattle. Well, I stayed and I decided I would like to buy a house of my own, although I was staying with him. So one day, looking through the papers, I saw a house for sale on 23rd Avenue, near the Montlake Bridge. I called up the man, the owner of the house, and he was very happy about it - he was real happy that I inquired about the house, and he asked me to come and look at the house.

WAS THIS A PRIVATE SALES?

A private sale. So I said I'll be there about 1 o'clock. I went there alone. I found the address of the house and I started toward the steps. I could see the owner of the house peeking through the window blind. Right away I knocked at the door. I said I was the one who called in response to the ad for a house for sale. I'd like to see it. "I'm very sorry," he said, "but we have already sold the house to my brother." What could I do? I turned around and went back.

HAD YOU CALLED THE SAME MORNING?

Yes, the same day. I called in the morning, about 8 o'clock. And then about 1 o'clock I made the appointment to see the house. I thought the house was close to the University that I could use it for the students; you know, to rent out rooms. That was my intention then. Well anyway, he said the house was already sold so I turned around and went home. About a week later I saw an ad for another house for sale. And so I called up the real estate people and inquired about it. I told them I was interested in the house and would like to look at it. He said, "Sure, come down any time. We are here and we will show it to you." Before I hung up the phone, I said, "Sir, I want to ask you something. Do you suppose you could sell the house to me if I told you I am a Filipino." He said, "Oh, I'm sorry, but we cannot sell the house to Orientals." So what could I do. I said, "Oh, I'm sorry," and I just hung up the phone.

WHAT REAL ESTATE FIRM WAS IT?

I don't remember.

DO YOU REMEMBER WHERE THE HOUSE WAS LOCATED?

It was located on 23rd also. Close to the University.

WHAT YEAR WAS THIS?

Before the election in 1964 when the open housing issue was very hot. They had a hearing on open housing and so I went there and spoke, endorsing open housing. And later on, the King County Commissioners had a hearing on it and I went there again and said something about the experiences I just told you. After this, about three years ago, I was looking for another place to stay. There were three of us - a friend, myself, and my brother and sister-in-law. By this time I already had a house of my own. I was married. We three would look around for houses to move into. The three families wanted to be neighbors again, you know; we did not want to get away from each other. So we started looking for lots on which we could build the houses. We went through the papers every day until finally we found lots which were located on 35th N.E. near the city, near the Nathan Hale high school. We went there and on the corner of the lot was the owner of the house. Actually, there were four lots there - his house and the three lots were for sale. The ad that he had in the papers said that he was selling the property for $19,000 - for the three lots. After the three families had seen the lots we made an offer of $18,000 - $6,000 for each lot. The real estate firm at Lake City said that if we could buy the three lots together as a package, that the owner would come down from the $19,000 that was advertised. So we were very happy about it that we were getting it for $18,000. The next day the real estate man told us that the man now had come down on the price of $19,000 but also that if we were willing to buy the three lots together and pay $18,000 he would not accept it on a cash basis. In other words, he wanted to be paid on terms, on so much a month. Now, how can you buy lots like that and build a house since the bank will not loan you any money unless the lot is paid for in full? The man, himself, saw us there, knew we were Filipinos, and that's the only way he could get away from selling us his lots. We were even willing to pay for the lots for $19,000, the three of us together. But he would not accept cash from us, only on a term basis. There was nothing we could do. So we just gave it up.

We looked around again and then we found another ad, a real estate firm near Lake Forest Park. He called us up one day and told us that there were several lots that were being sold for $6000 a piece if we were willing. We could go there and pick out what location we wanted. There were actually, I think, about 8 lots together. But they were willing to sell it for $6000 a piece. This is what the man told us. So we went there and looked at the lots there and we liked it.

IN THE LAKE FOREST PARK AREA?

No, it was close to the Nathan Hale high school - only on the other side. Now these were on the other side of Nathan Hale, close to Lake City. We offered them $5500 for each of 3 lots. But they would not give in. So we accepted the $6000 because my brother and sister-in-law did not have any more house. Their house was sold already and they had only enough time to move out their things from the house. Time was closing on us. So finally we decided to buy the lots for $6000 a piece. We got the lots we wanted, three lots together, and we signed the contract to buy the house. In fact, the agent, not the real estate agent, but the man representing the company, was there with us. And he was there when we signed the papers. The next day, the real estate people called up and said, "I'm sorry but the company has told us that unless you buy the entire 8 lots there could not be a sale. Some builder was going to buy it from them. So we had to give that up, too.

WHAT YEAR WAS THIS?

This was a little over two years ago.

THIS APPARENTLY HAD TO DO, NOT ONLY WITH THE DEVELOPER, BUT WITH THE REAL ESTATE COMPANY THAT WAS SELLING THE LOTS. YOU SAID THAT YOU SIGNED THE CONTRACT TO PURCHASE THE LOTS WHICH WAS THEN NEGATED BY THE DEVELOPERS?

I think the agent of the company went to the developers and talked to them and maybe he told them we were Filipinos; so he came back and said, "We cannot sell these lots individually."

IS THAT LEGAL? IF THE CONTRACT WAS ALREADY SIGNED BY BOTH PARTIES, AND IF THE REAL ESTATE AGENT IS THE AGENT FOR THE COMPANY -

I don't know, this is something we didn't go into any more. Well, since time was getting short and my sister-in-law had to have a house, we had to have a way of getting one. So we decided we would look for individual lots for each of us. Well, my sister-in-law found one, and they purchased it. They were able to buy it, and have a house built on it now. And the reason they were able to do this was because the owner of the property no longer resides around that area there, but outside of Seattle. He had to get rid of the property, regardless of who bought it. My brother and sister-in-law found their lot on 58th. My friend found one on 59th, and finally he was told by the owner that he was going to give this lot to his son. He was not going to sell it to anyone. I think it was because he found he was a Filipino.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Washington State Division of Real Estate require programs of affirmative action from licensed salesmen, brokers, apartment house owners and managers, as a condition for license. Some action that would be required of salesmen and brokers would be:

a. To maintain a policy of equal housing opportunities.

b. To advertise all listings with the slogan, "Equal Housing Opportunities," especially in media that will reach non-white, minority communities.

c. To instruct all employees and clientele that the policy is provision of equal housing opportunities.

d. To develop objective criteria for qualifying prospective occupants in both sales or rentals of housing.

e. To be familiar with the prohibited practices defined in Fair Housing Laws and carry out the intent of the law.

f. To maintain fair and consistent practices.

g. To recruit and employ qualified and qualifiable minority persons.

h. To place at places of business, conspicuously, an equal housing opportunity sign.

2. That the Washington State Division of Real Estate institute human relations and civil rights laws components in real estate courses taught to prospective salesmen or as refresher courses for others.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Larry Flores

About two years ago, in 1971, I was working for the Filipino Youth Activities. In August of that year, my partner and I, who is still with the FYA, were taking care of some business in the downtown area. I had split with my partner to take care of some business with Art Supplies, while he took care of some business at the Greyhound Bus Station. I was with one other student.

I parked on Ninth Avenue right at the bus depot, took care of my business, and came back to the car. My partner wasn't finished yet. It was a hot day and I didn't want to get inside the car to wait for him. So I just waited outside for him to come back. There was a fence there and I went and sat down on it, like any other normal citizen might do. I was in for a few surprises within the next five or ten minutes.

As I was sitting there, watching the traffic go by, and thinking about what I was going to do that day, a prowl car pulled up behind my car. The prowl car had "Military Police" written all over it, and inside were two guys in plain clothes. I figured they were officers coming to the Greyhound Bus Station to look for deserters. They got out of their car and locked the doors. They started coming towards me. I thought they were going to ask me for some information, some directions or something. I was prepared to tell them that I knew Seattle and where to go. They came up to me - one skinny guy, and one round guy - and got on each side of me. I was just sitting there when one of them said, "Show me some ID."

That really turned me around. I didn't quite realize what he had said to me. Then both of them said, "Show us some ID." And like a good Asian response, I went for my wallet. I was being very humble, and said, "Yes, sir."

And then I asked myself, "Why should I show them my ID?" I had worked for an insurance company at one time and as an investigator, I used to show my badge when I came up to the public. I remembered that. "This could be anybody asking me; it could be anybody," I thought to myself. Then I thought of a friend with the Seattle Human Rights Commission and decided it sounded like a good human rights case.

Then I said, "Wait a minute. I'm a civilian and I don't have to show my ID to anybody."

It didn't seem to shake those officers up any because then they both poured it on me. "Show us some ID; show us some ID."

But I was really tough and said, "Listen, I don't have to show anybody an ID. I don't even know who you are."

It surprised them that I was beginning to become a little angry and aggressive. They looked scared then, and I knew that they had violated some of my civil rights. One, they had not identified themselves, and two, they had not told me of any charge to hold me on. I figured that I was armed, that I had the Human Rights Commission behind me.

Then I turned the situation around and asked them for their ID. At that point, I became not just another young Asian who would respond, but someone who knew what he was talking about.

They seemed to realize that they had been harassing me by denying me my civil rights. They completely changed their attitude toward me: They called me, "Sir," and pulled out their badges for me to see.

I jokingly said, "They don't look real; they're fake badges." They were getting shook up now. "I'll show you my ID now; I think it's legitimate. By the way," I said, "I'm sure you have some reasons to stop and question me? Would you mind telling me why you stopped me on the street?"

They were really loose then. "Well," one of them said, "there's no problem, Mr. Flores. There was a mental patient that escaped this morning and we're out looking for him."

That made me mad and I said, "You're crazy! Do you have a description of the fellow you're looking for?"

They both said no.

They had just picked me off the street! I guess I looked looney to them.

This isn't the first case; there have been several cases of harassment that involve Asians. Some of the young Asians come to me and tell me what happened to them. They ask me for my advice. I can't tell you exactly how many people this has happened to, but I know that harassment occurs daily. Many more Asians internalize the whole incident, and I never hear about it. Young Asians in the area are stopped because they have long hair, or because they look high. They're stopped, ticketed, searched, put up against the wall, and everything else. As an example, there are three or four "long hairs" living together and their house is under surveillance. The police don't usually say what they are searching for; they just search. They don't usually charge the Asians with any crime; they are just detained. They call the Asians "Dirty Flips" or "Damn Orientals." These are very castigating remarks for some of our young people. Some of the young people are going to become angry enough to curse back at them as a reaction.

After my own incident, I recommended that better sensitivity training be included in all enforcement agencies - not just the Seattle Police Department, but the King County Police Department, the Aid

Patrol, the Marine Patrol and all other enforcement agencies around. The police should be more sensitive to our racial heritage.

An Asian American Advisory Council member then related an experience which happened to her son:

My son was returning from a basketball practice from school. He ran to catch the bus after making a stop-over at a store. A police car pulled up and the police inside called him over, saying, "Come here, son." My son went over and they asked him, "You're Oriental, aren't you?"

His response was one of confusion and he said, "Why?"

They then said, "Get in the car. When an officer asks you a question, you don't ask him why." They proceeded to give him the third degree in the back seat and told him that in the future, he was to speak courteously and respectfully to an officer. He had not even spoken discourteously!

ADDENDUM

Several newspaper articles in recent months have made reference to the problem of police harassment. The March 17, 1973 Seattle Post-Intelligencer ran two such articles. The first article quotes Alfred Cowles, the recently resigned Director of the State Human Rights Commission, as saying that he is leaving "a big piece of unfinished business - the harassment and intimidation of racial minorities by law enforcement officials." He emphasized the need for improving the relationships between racial minorities and the police.

The second article was a nationally syndicated column by NAACP Director Roy Wilkins entitled, "The Shooting of Blacks." While the main topic was harassment of blacks, many statements are clearly applicable to Asians as well. In referring to an incident which occurred in New Jersey in which an innocent black youth was shot by a white policeman, Wilkins stated, "In the policeman's mind, a dark skin meant "criminal." After citing another incident in which a non-uniformed black policeman was fatally shot by two white patrolmen, Wilkins emphasized that "Racial peace depends, among other things, on white policemen rooting out the instant association of crime and skin color."

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That expanded human relations training be mandatory for all law enforcement officers, including military police.

2. That there be an active recruitment and placement of Asians into law enforcement.

3. That all law officers be required to spend a portion of their duty time working with community groups that are predominantly minority and Asian.

4. That a multi-ethnic staff (civilian if necessary) be added to the Community Relations Division of the Seattle Police Department.

5. That an impartial body be created to conduct inquiries into and act on the complaints of citizens against police behavior.

6. That the Mayor be asked to require the Seattle Police Department to provide information on gambling crackdowns, etc., occurring in the International District and Central Area as compared to other communities.

MILITARY EXPERIENCE

Tom Mizuta

I went into the U. S. Marine Corps in 1969. I enlisted for two years and went to San Diego for recruit training. I was there from October to about December. While I was in recruit training I didn't feel that much or see that much discrimination. I was too tired, too sad, being away from home.

I do remember one instance very vividly. We were in a platoon inspection and this general was coming down the line. He supposedly picks marines out and starts asking them questions to see if they can hold their cool or not. He stopped in front of me and he asked my name and I gave my name. He said, "What are you?" While in the Marine Corps they taught me in basic training that I'm a marine, and that there is only one color and that is green. So I said, "I'm a marine, sir." Then he looked at me and said, "No, I mean what are you?" I just panicked. You always answered that you're a marine and be proud of it. I stood there and said, "I'm a marine, sir." He got kind of flustered and didn't know what to say and I didn't know what he wanted. Then he asked me again. And when he said it three times I thought he ought to know the answer and I remembered saying, "I'm an American, sir." There's this captain that's standing right next to him and he said, "No, he wants to know what you are - what race?" I still wasn't sure, but I figured he wanted one of the three major races - mongoloid, negroid, or caucasoid; so I said, "a mongoloid, sir." He said, "Oh, you're from Mongolia." Really, I was just shaking. I couldn't believe this guy in front of me. And I said, "Yes, sir," just to get him out of my way. All the troops around were just laughing. I still didn't know what he wanted until a guy told me afterwards that he wanted to know your race, that you're Japanese.

There was one other incident. They've got something called a "house mouse" in each platoon in basic training and he's usually the smallest person in the platoon. He is in charge of taking care of your shoes, cleaning up, and sweeping, like a housemaid. Since I wasn't the shortest guy, I didn't think I had anything to worry about. They went through five people who were ignorant without any high school education or anything - they couldn't keep the place clean. The guys just kicked them out of the way, so I became a house mouse for about two months. Why did he pick me? After going through five people, I still wasn't the shortest. It was supposed to go by height and yet I got picked.

After San Diego I went to Camp Pendleton for a month of training, then to Camp LeJeune. that was a different story altogether. I was only there for two months. It was really bad. I requested a transfer to Viet Nam - it was just too much. I didn't even want to leave the base. When I did the people looked at me as if I was just some sort of freak. I really noticed it and so did the white people around me. There were no Orientals for me to associate with in the Marine Corps, and so I associated with whites wherever I was. A lot of them were from the mid-West and the West Coast, and they would just sit there and couldn't understand the ignorance of the people outside the base. We stopped in a restaurant down in South Carolina, and there were two white guys about 35 years old at the table next to us. I got my food and so did my buddy and we started eating. The two white guys next to us had their food in front of them and they just quit eating. They just looked at me, you know, just staring. They stared a long time; I don't know whether I handled the fork differently, or what they expected. The white guy I was with noticed it too. Without looking at them he said to me, "Boy, I hate being stared at when I'm eating," and he got up. Those two guys got up and left.

I went to Viet Nam and since I could type 60 words a minute, I was put in an office. There weren't too many marines who could even type, let alone type fast. I was in that office for three months, and in those three months I really worked. They gave me a lot of work because I typed real good. So they used to pile up paper on me and I would just do all this work and it just got so frustrating. Promotions would come along and I'd get passed over. They would give meritorious promotions all the time. I think everybody in my office got at least two. I only got one. The minute I stepped in Viet Nam I got promoted to my next rank. And I never got another one the whole rest of the time I was there. New people would come in our office to work and they'd promote them, and they would promote them again. And I was still sitting there. I never had any office hours and I never got in any trouble. I never got pulled in front of the captain for anything bad. After three months I was on the verge of just cracking up. My nerves were on end and I was drinking pretty heavy. I don't know why, but my captain, who was in charge of the office, pulled me aside and he just talked to me about something. I remember at the end, he used the word "Jap." He said something like, "What do you think, Jap?" I really got uptight. I got flustered, and I started crying. I couldn't hit the guy. I said, "I just can't take it any more. I want a transfer." Well, he sent me out of the country to Thailand on a one-day pass. When I came back he thought I would be OK. I still requested a transfer. He said, "No, we need you too much in this office." So I just pulled the book out and said, "According to this, I can request a transfer and I can get it." Any marine if he wants to can go into combat. Instead of being in that office and working for him, I would rather be out in the field and fight. So he had to let me go. They sent me out with helicopters.

I still didn't get promoted. I flew in helicopters for nine months and got some commendations but I still didn't get promoted. I'd ask about it and they would tell me I wasn't the kind of material they want for a non-commissioned officer. I really couldn't understand that because there were so many stupid people there above me, giving me these stupid orders. I'd have to do more typing because this guy, at the next rank above me, couldn't type.

I got out four months early. They asked me if I wanted to stay in and the looked at my record. I remember going through separation and they said, "You're only an E-3, and you've been in Viet Nam 11½ months? You don't have any bad marks." And I said, "Yes, I know, it's just the breaks." They really screw you over - like that captain in charge of the office. The promotions had to go through him. I couldn't appeal my case or anything. If he said, No, he didn't think I was qualified, I couldn't get it; so, I never did.

All the services are set up with a pay scale from E-1 to E-9. When you first go into the service you're an E-1; after basic training you're an E-2, automatically. When I went over to Viet Nam, I was made an E-3 and I stayed at that level. A lot of my friends who went in with me went over to Viet Nam and came back as E-4's and E-5's. They can't understand why I was only an E-3.

IS THERE SOMETHING DEROGATORY IN BEING A HOUSE MOUSE?

Yes. I really didn't like it. It's like being a maid. You clean up, you sweep, you make the beds, shine shoes.

THAT'S NOT EXACTLY THE IMAGE OF THE MARINES?

No.

THE ASSIGNMENT OF HOUSE MOUSE WAS BASED UPON HEIGHT. WERE THERE OTHER KINDS OF ASSIGNMENT OF MARINES BASED UPON HEIGHT?

Yes. I don't know how many people have heard of "tunnel rats." When I was going through basic training they said that anyone 5'8 or below had to use a .45 and start crawling into tunnels. And a lot of us were really scared. At basic we were told that they were going to stick a miner's lamp on your head, give you a .45 and tell you to go down in this tunnel after the Viet Cong. That was because of height too.

DO YOU THINK THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN GET OUT OF DISCRIMINATING SITUATIONS IS TO CHOOSE SOMETHING MORE DANGEROUS?

Yes. Asians who have been in the ground forces and in the field have said that they haven't faced as much discrimination out in the field where you have to really rely on each other. You couldn't have any personal differences because you have to put your life in his hands and vice versa. I was in the back - rear echelon. I would go flying in helicopters all day and still come back to the rear echelons. I slept and lived in comparative safety so more personal hangups came out.

DID YOU HEAR ABOUT EXPERIENCES OF OTHER ASIANS?

One guy I know was stationed on a mountain top radar station outside of San Francisco. Every weekend and every other day, he would get in his car and take off for Chinatown in San Francisco and be a regular civilian just to get away from the military. He said he could picture me being the only Asian on a military base since he knew how his base was. He would be called "Chink" and all this by these other whites he was working with. He couldn't take it. To me, it just became an everyday thing to be called "Jap." I was called that by everybody. I lived in a hooch with seven other people. I was called Jap all the time, just jokingly, like the lights would be off and we would just be lying there, rapping, and they would say, "Say, Mizuta, remember Pearl Harbor?" and it just got to be an everyday thing.

It was from the officers that I really couldn't take it. My captain had called me that. My captain was supposed to be somebody who could lead men and he's supposed to be smart- not ignorant or stupid. I couldn't understand why, because he was the captain. I looked in his record book and he had been promoted to captain out of the ranks. In Viet Nam they had a shortage of officers, so a bunch of staff NCO's were promoted all the way up to lieutenant and captain and put them in charge of men. And I really think that cuts the quality down.

COMPARED TO THE ARMY OR THE AIR CORPS, DO YOU THINK THE MARINE CORPS HAS MISTREATED YOU MORE?

Personally, No. But I think the racism and the violence is worst in the Marine Corps. I didn't see it personally, but by working in the office I typed a lot of reports, hospital reports, like the nature of accidents, fistfighting, etc. They have their own vigilante groups. I was the only Asian in my base of 2000 men. I didn't have any group to go to. I worked at the club. They kind of liked me up there because I could break up black and white fights. They didn't pick on me because they didn't know what side I was on. I was neutral because of my skin color. So I would just bust up fights. I remember a couple of guys saying, "You'd better watch out or I might shoot you and nobody is going to say anthing." That was just another everyday thing that I expected. If I made somebody mad, I expected somebody to threaten to shoot me.

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN SINGLED OUT AS LOOKING LIKE THE ASIAN ENEMY?

Personally, I haven't. I hear that some Asian guys have been singled out, put in front, and be pointed out as what an enemy looks like.

IS THAT THE TERM THEY USE, ASIANS?

The popular term in Viet Nam is "Gook." In today's society I've been hearing it more and more on the streets. Gook! I don't know how most people feel about this, but I hate that word.

DO YOU FIND THAT AMONG THE VIET NAM VETERANS THAT THEY USE THAT WORD VERY FREQUENTLY?

Yes I do. I'll give you an example. When I was stationed at North Carolina, I had an army buddy who worked in the Pentagon at Washington, D.C. I'd escape some time and go up to Washington, D.C. to visit him. When I went to Viet Nam and came back, I saw him at Fort Lewis. He was about ready to get out. He asked me how the racial discrimination was over there? I said, "It's an everyday thing." And he said, "It's a funny thing - I was just waiting near the ....area at Fort Lewis when the vets were coming back and all these guys started to call me Gook, Slope, Slant Eyes, Jap, and I couldn't understand why." Here were a bunch of Viet Nam vets calling him that stuff. He just couldn't get used to it.

Another thing is, when I was in training, a lot of older GI's would come up to you and start saying things like, "Boy, you guys get to go overseas and you get all that nooky." They had gone over to Japan and Korea, and some of the other places. That's all people would talk about going overseas - just to get a good piece of ass. It just got sickening after awhile. There was one guy from Oklahoma who went through the service with me. He came up to me and asked me, "Is it true that Oriental girls got horizontal vaginas?" That's so ridiculous, I almost got sick. I couldn't believe this guy.

WHEN DID YOU SERVE IN THE MARINES?

From October '69 to June of '71.

WHAT DID THE INSPECTOR GENERAL DO OR WAS THERE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL?

We had an Inspector General but when he came around, we'd all clear out and he'd go through the record files to see that we had everything up to date and then he'd leave. As to anything else, no, he was doing nothing. We also had a Provost Marshall on the base.

FOR THOSE ASIAN AMERICANS THAT WERE POINTED OUT AS AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT THE ENEMY LOOKED LIKE, DO YOU HAVE THE FEELING THAT THIS CONTRIBUTED TO INCREASED RACIAL HOSTILITIES TOWARD THEM?

I think the Asian stereotype takes care of that real good. When I was in basic we had a cross-country run and I came in something like the middle, and somebody came up to me and said, "I thought all Asians could run fast." Just little things. Other enlisted men have told me this, that their feelings toward Asians were based on how they thought they were.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Inspector General's office review personnel records and investigate whether or why individuals with good records are denied promotions and to take appropriate action when discrimination is discovered.

2. That the armed services, including the National Guard require human relations training for all officers and servicemen during their tour of duty and immediately prior to discharge.

3. That the practice of pointing to Asian Americans as an example of the enemy be banned and violations be subject to discipline.

4. That the practice of delegating such jobs as "house mouse" according to height or race be banned.

5. That each branch of the armed services establish offices of civil rights to deal with problems of discrimination and to develop affirmative action programs.

6. That an immediate study be made to determine all areas of disparate treatment because of race and that recommendations be developed as to goals, timetables, and monitoring to alleviate this treatment.

7. That the use of racially derogatory name-calling by officers or servicemen be subject to discipline and/or reduction in rank.

8. That there be fair and consistent criteria for promotions as well as opportunity for review, appeal, and redress if such criteria are not followed.

9. That recruitment advertising which picture men in uniform also include Asians in uniform.

10. That any visual aid used by the armed services for training purposes depict Asian servicemen as well as others in the same positive manner.

11. That all written and visual aids used for training purposes be reviewed by a multi-ethnic team to determine its appropriateness and to recommend remedial action in the non-technical aspects.

12. That specific provisions relating to racial discrimination be written into official armed services regulations with specified disciplinary actions.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Gregory Tsang

I came today to testify to a personal experience regarding acts of discrimination against an elderly Asian lady who applied for financial assistance from the King North office of the Service Delivery Division of the Department of Social and Health Services of the state of Washington. This elderly Asian lady is very dear to my heart. She is 78 years old and I have known her for a lifetime. She is my mother. However, I came here today not to present an isolated case, such as the one I shall describe; I'm using this as an example of, perhaps, many occasions of a similar nature that may have already occurred. And if something is not being done about it, perhaps we will have many more in the future. In my mother's situation I have already found a remedy to change the situation.

If you apply for public assistance, there are several obstacles that you have to overcome, particularly for Asian applicants. The first one would be that they do not know the services available. Second, they may know they are available but for certain reasons of their own they are reluctant to apply. The third possibility is they know the services available, they are ready to try to hazard it, however, they do not have the facilities to apply, such as language barrier, and so forth. And lastly, they know exactly where to go and are ready to go; but, they run into difficulties when they apply because of the insensitivity of the workers and the way they were handled. In my mother's situation, it is the very last case.

I'm going to present my testimony today in four parts - the first part very briefly on the background of my mother as far as it applies. And second, what happened in the process of application for public assistance. Thirdly, I will mention what's wrong with this, from my own personal observation. And finally, I will make some general comments.

My mother came to Seattle on July 30, 1968 - nine months after I did. Later on, she obtained immigrant status, through the condition of my sister, Mrs. Chin Lu. My sister is a naturalized citizen. About two years ago I called public assistance because my mother needed some medical care and treatment. She was insured at Group Health. However, we needed more money to take care of the insurance because she was not under full coverage. Somebody told me over the telephone that my mother was not qualified because she had to be here five years as an immigrant and after that time she would be qualified. So I just let it go at that. In the early part of last year, I made another call to try to find if there was a change in regulations, and the response was the same. She had to be here five years to be able to apply for any public assistance, including medical assistance.

However, last summer I worked in an Asian project as a director and we were trying to find out all possible services provided by the various agencies in the State Social and Health Services. One of the places we contacted at that time was Public Assistance. From our investigation there was no indication that there was a magic year, like five years, that would prevent an immigrant from applying for public assistance. So I had a big question mark in my mind. Right after the project, on August 24, I went in to apply for my mother for public assistance. I was asked to return a few days later and I did, filling out the application for assistance form which I sent in. I spoke to the intake worker. I told her that my mother, for the past five years, had been receiving financial assistance from her children, including myself. We put in money for my mother - $125 monthly, which was indicated on the form. However, I asked, as a legal matter, if my mother was qualified for public assistance as an immigrant, we would not continue this form of support.

I also asked her to clarify whether it was necessary for my mother to come in person to apply because she could not speak English. She said that it was all right, that I could apply for her. So my name is actually on the application form. I was the one to help my mother apply; also, my brother and my wife signed as witnesses. And so she said. "OK, everything is fine. She's an immigrant, she's been here so many years, and she is qualified for assistance. Go home and wait. The first check will come in two weeks or whatever." On the first of September, I received a letter from the Public Assistance agency that said - it was addressed to my mother - that you do have resources available to meet your needs. According to the immigration department regulations, relatives agreed to support you when you came to this country. Since you were and continue to be unemployable, they are therefore obligated to support you. And if there is a change in situation, you have to state why resources are not available to you.

Between the 5th and 20th of September, Public Assistance made phone calls to the Immigration office without our knowledge. They contacted three persons in Immigration, and the Immigration person located the file, which my sister filed for my mother, and gave them the phone number of her husband. He's working in New York State. Then they called long distance to the company where my brother-in-law is working, and from there they got the number of my sister and called my sister at home. And so all of a sudden, out of a blue sky, my sister received a phone call saying something like, "You know that you pledged support, now your mother is applying for public assistance. What do you think is going to happen?" Things like that. Because of this phone call, my sister was very much scared. She answered them, "Well, we have been doing this for the past five years so if this is the case, just drop the application."

On the 20th of September a letter was addressed to my sister by the worker who had made the phone call. She said in the letter that, "You have been sending your mother $50 monthly and you are willing to continue this support. According to the Immigration department, your husband signed the application of support which states that he was assuring the immigration naturalization service the above named person would not become public charges." And then it said, "Application will be pending until we hear from you regarding the amount of support available to her. Because of this letter and because of the phone call, my sister wrote me and said, "Gregory, I received a letter from the DSHS and they told me that your application for mother for welfare has been denied. You know why. Because at the time mother applied for residence, we pledged financial support. Now you say you discontinued support. You just can't do it. I wrote them a letter saying that we would continue to support our mother and to throw out the application. You did something very stupid. I don't know why you came up with such an idea. From now on you will continue to pay your due and therefore our mother will not feel so bad about it" - things like that.

Then, September 21st, in a letter they said that it is an eligibility requirement that there be a face-to-face contact. You must come in to talk to us before we can consider the case. I told them my mother had gone to visit my sister, and she was not here now. I went to the office again and tried to argue with them about it. I was referred to the financial supervisor. She told me that "We have already contacted your sister and she has agreed to support to the extent of $50 and if you and your brother quit your part of support, we have to write the immigration office telling them that your sister is only putting in $50, not supporting her fully." I said, "Hold it. I'll have to go for some legal counsel before you go ahead with playing that part of the game." A letter followed the next day, addressed to my mother saying that "You are no longer a resident of Washington, and therefore you are ineligible completely for public assistance." That concludes all the correspondence I had with them.

I made a last visit to the office last Thursday. I went there to talk to the workers. I asked her to open her books. I had consulted with two lawyers, one from legal services. They had said, "Gregory, if you serve as attorney for your mother, you can ask them to open the books." They gave me a form to sign that reads like this: Gregory Tsang is my attorney and is my representative and is hereby authorized to review all my case, all my files and records relating to my assistance grant. So I went in with this magic paper. Of course, they said, "No, you cannot look at our books." So they called the assistant attorney general. The response was that the information available was only that part the client has actually put in the record. Anything beyond that could not be touched.

Let me state briefly what is wrong with the procedure. First, the affidavit of support has no legal binding on the person who signed it. This has been elaborated, both by those two lawyers I contacted, and even by the financial worker herself. When I called the legal office, they told me this affidavit wouldn't stand the test of the court. And the DSHS knows that it will not be binding. Why did the casework supervisor still use it as an instrument in the letter she sent to my sister, giving her the impression that she was delinquent? That's the first part that's wrong with it.

The second part that I think is wrong is this: the procedure we went through. If they wanted to contact my sister to find out what she could contribute, they could have asked me, and I could write to my sister and ask her to write a letter to say we are not the legal support. This would be all the information required. The administrator at the office told me that there is a slight difference between someone who turned down support and someone for whom support is not available. Therefore, they had to verify that part. For that argument I would say this. If they wanted to find out, they could have, without going through Immigration to get to my sister.

I have a memo from a person who is now working as a minority specialist for the Department of Social and Health Services. In this memo he says, "According to the Immigration District in Seattle, aliens with a permanent visa - which my mother has - may apply for public assistance." ... "The fact that the state or the municipality pays for the services accepted by the alien is not by itself a test of whether the alien has become a public charge." ... "Nowhere in the procedures are states required to report aliens who apply for public assistance." Whether or not an alien is reported to Immigration is determined by the state law on agency procedures. The state law on agency procedure does not mention that you have to go through Immigration.

Another point I would like to mention is the term "public charge." It has been clarified by this memo that I just referred to; it is not a public charge for an immigrant to apply for public assistance. Also there was a letter from the Department of Health Services addressed to the Attorney General re:public charge. The answer was again it was not a public charge.[1]

They said that my mother was not a resident and thus ineligible. She came to the United States and stayed in Seattle. She does visit the other brothers occasionally but I, as the eldest son of my mother, would be the prime resident from the state. To conclude my testimony, I think there is a tremendous gap between the resolution and the practice. The Immigration office, the administrator could say, "We don't want any checking." But they can have three enthusiastic employees search out a folder to get information, to make a phone call, and make a duplicate copy of that report; I think that is something wrong. And second, there is no written rule that says you have to do some checking but the Department of Social and Health Services goes to the trouble of making a long distance call. That's wrong. Because Asians are physically identifiable, many practices that are supposed to be equal and fair are unequal and unfair.

I would like to tell you of another personal experience. At the college where I work, the registrar checks everyone who has a foreign accent, including Asians. If you are an immigrant and if your card is not in a year, you must pay out of state tuition. But, if you speak good English you pass, you must have been here a year, so there's no point in checking. So the same thing happened in public assistance. You come in with an Asian accent, therefore you must show your card, you have to check with Immigration.

---

[1] To become a public charge there must be three elements: 1) a liability for payment for services, 2) a demand for payment, and 3) there must be refusal or omission of payment.

To stop all this from happening I have a few things I would like to recommend. I think, first of all, the department's regulations are not enough, because when things are being done at the lowest level, it is those persons that determine what it means. And those persons are the ones serving the clients from day to day. They can twist, misinterpret, and make service deliveries difficult for Asian applicants. They should know these regulations. There is no excuse for them not to follow them and do something different. I would also like to see that the role of the Council is more publicized, so that we know there's a body who is sitting here with a charge to change something that is not good. When something happens to Asians and it is wrong, they will know that they can go and appeal the case. If a person of my sister's background could receive a phone call and be intimidated to the point where she says I quit, if a person of my background and my kin also has to fight so vigorously to get fair treatment, what would it be like for someone else - an Asian immigrant who is not capable of handling anything like this?

WHAT GAVE THE IMMIGRATION OFFICE THE NOTION THAT YOUR MOTHER WAS NO LONGER A RESIDENT OF WASHINGTON STATE? HOW LONG WAS SHE AWAY?

Not Immigration, Public Assistance. Because I told them my mother was now visiting my sister. And I also told them she would come back as soon as they would open up the case.

SUMMARY

From the testimony of Mr. Tsang and documents:

1. Mr. Tsang's immigrant mother, Mrs. Shu Chin Tsang, has applied for and is eligible for medical and financial assistance from the State of Washington Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

2. The refusal of DSHS to furnish this assistance is based upon two points: availability of family resources, and residential requirements.

3. The first point on availability of resources stems from an inquiry by DSHS to the U. S. Immigration Department. The information held by the latter has no relevancy for DSHS except if the alien becomes a public charge. As stipulated by Immigration, Mrs. Tsang does not fit this description of a public charge. Further, the Immigration Department divulged information from Mrs. Tsang's file to DSHS which resulted in an intimidation of her daughter in New York, Mrs. Lu, who feared for her mother's possible deportation. The role of Immigration in this matter is irregular. The DSHS has a right and responsibility to inquire as to availability of family resources for

Mrs. Tsang; this should have been obtained directly through Mr. Gregory Tsang.

4. The second point for refusal of assistance was that the requirement for residency in the state was not fulfilled. The face-to-face provision required her presence at a time when she was visiting her daughter, as she occasionally does visit other family members. This would not seem to violate the residency requirement.

ADDENDUM

There are many families in the Asian community who have sponsored relatives in the United States. It is not uncommon to see families bringing over grandparents, young brothers and sisters.

In many cases, the sponsor will find that he is unable to support the relatives indefinitely. The sponsor will not often seek assistance because he believes that if support stops, the relative will be immediately processed for deportation. It would be noted that "sponsorship" is a moral obligation and not a legal one. This has already been established in court.

The question that comes up is that if he accepts any form of public assistance, doesn't this person become a "public charge" and is then deportable?... it is not true that receiving public assistance makes the alien a "public charge."

"The fact that the state or the municipality pays for the services accepted by the alien is not, then, by itself, the test of whether the alien has become a "public charge." (4.21 a) Deportation of Aliens in the United States.

--Norris Vincente Bacho in Asian
Community Forum, University of
Washington Daily, March 27, 1973.

ADDENDUM

Interview with Marilyn Munday and Sheri Olson, King County North Branch, Department of Social and Health Services, March 20, 1973.

Interviewers investigate all applicants. This helps in determining if anything else is needed, in terms of information or aid. At least one face-to-face contact interview is required for the application process. If the applicant cannot come to the office, e.g., the person is hospitalized, then a caseworker will be asked to go out to meet the applicant.

When the application is being processed, or when aid is being applied for, the applicant must be in the area. This is not to say, however, that the person must be in the area during the entire time he/she is receiving aid. The recipient can visit people who are not residing in the area and still receive aid when they come back.

Thus, the residency at the time of application and the face-to-face interview are the only two requirements involved in the process, other than the filing of the application from itself.

In Mrs. Tsang's case, no one seemed to know exactly when she was coming back to Seattle. This seemed to be cause for the office to question her status as a resident of the area. There is no minimum length of time that a person must be in the area to be eligible for aid.

If it is determined that the applicant is an immigrant who has been here less than five years, then, according to an office policy, as opposed to a manual regulation, the interviewer calls up the Immigration Office for more information about the applicant. Merely receiving aid is not sufficient reason to be considered a public charge. Whereas the terms "public charge" and "aid recipient" are not synonymous according to the Immigration Office, in the eyes of the DSHS, the terms are synonymous. This can be a source of confusion for many potential immigrant welfare applicants. Also, citizenship is not a requirement for aid. This does not usually even come up in the interview, that is, the applicant is not asked if he/she is a U. S. citizen or not. Such information would eventually come up in subsequent questions about Medicare and Social Security.

Mrs. Tsang used her immigration card for her validating identification in the application. Thus, the interviewer knew immediately that she was an immigrant. When the interviewer discovered that she had been here only two years, the Immigration Office was consulted as to her entry status and other information regarding her available resources.

The interviewers receive no in-service training in the area of working with people of Asian descent. They are not aware of many of the dynamics of the Asian applicant.

The final, formal reason for rejection of the application for aid was the fact that Mrs. Tsang was not in the area at the time that the application was being processed and therefore not available to follow through on the face-to-face interview.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services review all Economic Service policies and procedures and revise those pertaining to Asian immigrants to eliminate harmful practices and to inform all intake workers of these policies.

2. That the staff of this public agency be required to have human relations training.

3. That the agency employ bilingual staff to facilitate utilization and processing.

4. That the agency develop an ombudsman office to develop procedures for receiving and investigating public complaints.

5. That rules, regulations, procedures, and forms of the agency be translated into Asian languages.

RELIGION

Tsuguo Ikeda

My name is Tsuguo Ikeda. I'm an Asian Methodist, and have been a member of the Commission on Religion and Race for the Methodist Church for years, and this report relates to those two experiences.

The United Methodist Church started to work with Asians way back in 1890 and developed separate Asian conferences - the Chinese had one, the Koreans, the Japanese in the Methodist churches, as well as Filipinos. In 1964 all the Asian Methodist churches were to be integrated into a unified whole church. There was a period up to '67 when the Asian Methodist churches were slowly dying. Once you were merged into the white conference, you sort of disappeared. The decision which started out as a great step forward in '64 was in two years marred by disillusionment. The ministers who remained were demoralized by the insensitivity of the majority to the special needs of the Asian people. A series of Asian meetings funded by the Church were held in 1967, 1970, and 1971 to identify to the United Methodist Church how ineffective the structure, policies, and programs were to Asian Methodists.

The first large-scale Asian convocation held on March 12, 1971 in Santa Monica, California, involved Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, and Japanese Americans representing 68 congregations and 13,780 persons. The convocation set forth a position statement directed to the United Methodist Church, "We, the Asian American Caucus of the United Methodist Church, which includes at the present time Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, and other groups who have similar ethnic roots, acknowledge the heritage that is peculiarly ours as Asians. We have been a part of the United Methodist Church. While acknowledging the value of this heritage, we recognize that our participation within the United Methodist Church had been only partial and limited, in that our identity as Asians has been in terms of Euro-American values and cultures." In July of 1971, the Commission on Religion and Race of the Methodist Church provided funds to operate research projects and the development of Asian ministers, and established the first advisory arm of Asian American ministers. This committee began to provide the means for the Caucus and be the official force within the United Methodist Church.

Our related profile studies conducted by the Commission of Religion and Race for the year 1969 and 1970 gave employment statistics on the various boards and agencies of the Church. In 1971, one per cent of the professionals were, collectively, Asians, Chicanos, and Indians, of which 10% were Asians. Of the non-professionals, there were 2% collectively in 1969 and 3% in 1971. In 1969 they just had a general category but in 1971 they identified the Asians and how many there were. Non-professionals were 2% Asian in 1971. Board memberships of the various boards and agencies in 1969 collectively were 2%; in 1971 it was 1% Asian (a 1% increase); board officers in 1969 collectively were 2%; in 1971 it was 1% - 0 for Asians. Similarly for committee chairmen, chairmanships for Asians in 1971.

DID THAT INCLUDE FUNDED PROGRAMS?

No. Let's look at the national structure from the point of view of the national boards. During 1969-71, there were only 2% Asians in the Methodist boards and agencies. The report to the General Conference of the United Methodist Church on April 16-28, 1972, had this observation by Bishop Matthews: "I am aware that when most of us hear the term racist, it either turns us off or offends us. In further thought,however, all of us realize the essential racist character of our society in earnest deplore the fact that with justification this can be attached to the Church. The positive side of this is that we are offered in our day a new humanity as we endeavor to lessen .... racism." So there is recognition in the United Methodist Church, by at least some of the leadership that racism exists in the church. The thing that is so hard to accept is that the church is racist. It is so anti-Christian to say the least.

To remedy in part the exclusion of minorities within the national structure, the General Conference of 1972 ruled that all national boards and commissions have at least two Asians, two blacks, two Chicanos, two Indians, as well as ethnic youth. Local conferences were also urged to do the same. One of the recommendations of the General Conference was to call upon each jurisdictional conference in its 1972 elections to make an intentional effort to constitute a college of bishops which would adequately reflect the ethnic and racial pluralism of the jurisdiction. On July 14, 1972 a Western Jurisdiction meeting in Seattle elected the first bishop of Asian ancestry in the United Methodist Church. The Western Jurisdiction includes Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Idaho, and Nevada. I believe that he is the only Asian at the bishop level in any Christian church. The latter two actions of the United Methodist Church are only beginning.

WE HAVE BEEN HEARING ABOUT THE METHODISTS. DO YOU KNOW IF THERE IS ANY INFORMATION LIKE THIS ABOUT, SAY, THE BAPTISTS?

Yes, there are Asian caucuses for Baptists - but the problem has been that the system has been going on its merry way and it has taken quite an effort by the Asians to say that the church needed to be an open church, including Asians in leadership roles, and how best the Asian experience could be translated and understood by the church. It is fortunate that we do have a staff to begin to formulate the strategy to assist in the formulation. I feel that what has been done within the Methodist Church is just a bare beginning step. It will take even greater determined effort to help the church develop its full potential.

IN THE BEGINNING WE HAD ASIANS SEPARATE, AND THEN THERE WAS A MERGING, AND THEN THERE WAS A LOSS OF IDENTITY WITHIN THE WHITE MASS, NOW THERE IS A TURN BACK. IS THAT CORRECT?

Yes, partially. I think this is, in a way, contradictory. But I think we need to do both. The Filipino Methodists, the Korean Methodists, the Japanese Methodists, the Chinese Methodists, or the Samoan Methodists need to strengthen their own identity as a culture-rich group, and yet have the opportunity to cross ethnic barriers. I feel we need both strategies to gain a respect of our own identity, yet at the same time, to help the broader church to understand its responsibility and role as a church.

WOULD YOU COMMENT ON THE MORMON'S EXCLUSIONARY POLICY?

At least they are above board. That I can respect in a certain way. But it is going to take a mammoth job. And yet I'm sure the majority of Methodists do not see this to be much of a problem. We now have an Asian bishop, so they feel that the problem is solved. The other day, questions were raised as to whether Dr. Choy could relate to white Methodists, whether he had the skills, experience, or whether people would accept him. He was elected, however, because the Asians were determined to help the church realize its potential, and that the church was blessed in having Asians. Think of the richness of the Western area - a black bishop in L.A., a white bishop in San Francisco, an Asian bishop in Seattle!

THE PRESBYTERIANS SEEM TO HAVE INITIATED ASIAN THEOLOGICAL TRAINING EFFORTS.

I really have not engaged in such activities myself. I know that in certain kinds of efforts, like theological training, Asians are banding together, nation wide, to develop a seminary specialty in Asian ministry. Dr. Roy Sano in the area is taking up more of this kind of specialty. Efforts are being made to encourage the various denominations to pool their resources to help develop an identity and theology, and training for Asians. I think there will be a major contribution from training - that's just one of the areas for improvement. Another one is, certainly, hiring. How many Asians are there that are ministers of major churches, large churches? You will find that this is a pretty closed operation for whites only. This means greater salary and other fringe benefits if one has a larger church and larger responsibilities. So the Asian minister is limited in his job opportunities, and is stunted because of the practice of discrimination.

DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATION AND CURRICULA IN THE CHURCH SCHOOLS, ESPECIALLY WITH REGARD TO MINORITIES?

Some efforts are being made but I have no first-hand knowledge. The question has been raised and Dr. Komura who was at the national level was placed into a major church. He left the national post, and, I believe, is working in this area.

I would say education along this line is very limited. It would be good to incorporate Asian experience as a Christian for kids to look at. I think efforts are being made to change.

DO YOU THINK EFFORTS OF THE BLAINE METHODIST CHURCH HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL?

Much of this effort relates to a group of volunteers. And again, it's the same thing that the minorities are continually having to do - to do what the professionals are supposed to do, or have the expertise to do, but haven't done within the Christian context.

WHEN IT COMES TO THE REVISION OF SOME OF THESE THINGS IS IT POSSIBLE TO HIRE PROFESSIONALS TO DO THAT - NOT ON A VOLUNTEER BASIS?

I think we can get Asians who are professionally trained, but not necessarily in this field, and then other laymen who can be trained to respond to a particular need. I feel that we need this option where professional services and skills are lacking.

WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE METHODIST CHURCH IS A LEADER IN THIS AREA?

Yes. The national church in the general conference has put openings on every level, across the board, and carried it out to the local level. So for the first time, we have Asians all up and down the pipeline. We are hearing of what is happening and hearing of ways how best to utilize the church, access to more authority and its resources, and to understand its limitations. And I feel that by richness of its diversity the Methodist church has a tremendous future. And it is because of this diversity and its inclusion that it is going to be a great church. I'm very hopeful, but because most Methodists do not see it as a real problem, then I feel somewhat pessimistic, on that basis. It will take concerted long-term efforts to correct institutional biases and practices that is deep in the church. And as I said earlier, it is so anti-Christian to say that the church is racist - that is in itself a major problem.

DO YOU THINK THERE IS A CHANGE ABOUT THE MISSIONARY ATTITUDE OF CHURCHES?

Yes. A good part is due to the development within those countries of the world where they have said, Missionaries go home. We want to do our own thing, with our own people. You can assist us technically but we need to be a part in developing our program ourselves. And so there has been a change in the philosophy of the missionaries. But I think it is probably because more countries of the world have become much more aware of their own needs and want to do it their way.

ARE THERE DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AT THE NATIONAL AND AT THE LOCAL LEVEL?

The funds of the Commission of Religion and Race may or may not be directly church oriented. If the project is developed by a particular ethnic group, then the support of the Commission of Religion and Race is solidly behind it. They want projects to develop as the minority group sees the problem and wants to attack it. That part is encouraging - the greater options and the increased activity.

One general observation is this. The national structure tends to be a little bit more liberal. The closer you come to home, the more conservatism one sees. It's a common phenomena, whether it is a church group or a political group. So if you come right down to the individual member of the United Methodist Church and his attitudes, it is still difficult to effect change.

IS THERE ROOM FOR OPTIMISM?

Yes. Structurally, by giving these kinds of options that get in on the system; nationally, in helping to restate its goals; defining it with this kind of multiplicity of input; I feel it has further promise of being a rich and Christlike church. And then I think it will have its impact down through the system. But I'm less optimistic that it will have an impact on the individual similarly, but the hierarchy is a well organized chain of responsibility. As you change the national, and the church says this is the way it's going to be, the discipline will respond in certain ways. It is not a democratic process in its own way. There are defined rules that say that churches can no longer be segregated. Through the Commission of Race and Religion, we are trying to integrate a central jurisdiction throughout all the black churches and the white. It is difficult to hear from the people what their problems are. At a certain point, the church says authoritaritively that this problem is no more, it has been ruled, and it is going to be done. In the integration, because of the Asian experience of being submerged, the blacks were very concerned that their black superintendents would be eliminated. The blacks who had conference and leadership roles in many black churches were eliminated when they merged into the white conferences. And so a guarantee was set up so that there would be at least as many black leaders as there had been in the area.

IF THE MINISTER OF A LOCAL CHURCH MAKES A PUBLIC STATEMENT - WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THAT THROUGH THE HIERARCHY?

One could raise questions, one could complain - like I have done to let certain individuals know clearly that they are racists.

COULD YOU GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF THAT?

I won't say any names, of course. I'll just say this person was in leadership in the Northwest, and he told me that there were no qualified Asians who could serve as a bishop. And I said, "Where do you get that authority?" And he said, "I have analyzed all the abilities, ages, etc. of the West Coast," and then he opened his mouth and said the thing about blacks. So within the voting delegation he exhibited all the past practices which had excluded Asians getting up in the system in order to qualify nomination - not being a theologian, an Asian, and not having the credentials to be a bishop. It is painful to confront a person in public; yet, that's one lousy and painful way.

COULD YOU EXPAND ON THE PLACING OF ASIAN MINISTERS INTO CHURCHES?

Historically, it has been scrutinized. Today the problem is twofold: one is there still is that resistance to an Asian in a white church, and the precedence is pretty limited. Asian ministers who are qualified are limited to the assignments in a church; and then the other factor is the Asian administrator decides for himself whom he should relate to in finding his own identity. While I believe the options may begin to open up, generally speaking, it has been pretty much a closed shop.

ARE ASIAN METHODIST CHURCHES IN FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES?

No, the Methodist church has a system of subsidizing a church. A pretty fair number of our Asian churches are self-supporting, but just above the poverty line, and that is also part of the problem.

ADDENDUM

THE ASIAN AMERICAN BAPTISTS*

The Declaration of Asian American Baptist Ethnic Strategy Convocation held at Los Angeles stated:

"Denominationally, we have taken the assimilation stance in hopes of integrating the 'model minority' into our normal American society. We have felt that it was our Christian responsibility to do away with clusters of ethnic groups which perpetuate their identities as 'unassimilable' and through contacts and inter-personal, intercultural involvement eventually hope to do away with the difference that make for segregation and discrimination.

"Twenty-five years have now passed since the close of the war and it is the strong conviction among the Asian American Christian leadership that what has taken place through this assimilation stance has not only caused a loss of identity but has had a dehumanizing affect upon them. This is especially acute among the third generation (Sansei) who are now experiencing a great deal of confusion concerning their identity - they are asking, "Who am I? Am I White or Asian?

---

*Material from Reverend Paul Nagano, Japanese Baptist Church, Seattle.

"Christian responsibility recognizes the sovereignty of God which means for the Asian American, first of all, an appreciation of his God-given heritage - of being thankful to God for his Asian heritage; and secondly, destroying the superior-inferior dichotomy which assumes man bowing to man rather than to God. It means to affirm what God has created as beautiful and to give God all praise for all the natural endowments of life. It means that yellow is beautiful, as is black and white. It means giving thanks to God for the beauty of variety and the richness of each culture and identity. For the Asian American it means to refrain from bowing their heads to the majority or to the establishment, but bowing to God in whose image they have been created.

"Christian responsibility calls for change - the changing of individuals, society, and culture from man's deification of himself to the kingdom of God. This means the Church is called to translate the gospel to the political arena - called to change individuals, institutions, and culture.... If a man is a Christian he is already part of this ethical reality, and he is free to do what he ought to do in participating in God's activity in the world in the creation of the conditions of human life by which human fulfillment is really possible. It does not merely mean a change of heart in the sense of religious conversion. It also means a change of racism and anything in our culture that reinforces this dehumanization."

With approval and funding of the Asian American Baptist Convocation from the church leadership, there came into being the Asian American Baptist Caucus in August 1971. The minutes of their meetings indicate their goals, concerns, and directions:

1. Placement of Asians into the governing councils, boards, and committees of the church.

2. Greater support of ethnic churches struggling with limited resources.

3. Establishment and support of new Asian ministries that have a pressing need, e.g., for San Francisco Chinese immigrants; Korean ministry in Buffalo, New York, and/or Southern California; a Filipino ministry, completely neglected now, here and in Hawaii; a Samoan ministry to the new influx into California.

4. Programs involving the church and community in the needs of the elderly and of youth.

5. The establishment of Asian American church centers for research and development of Asian American churches in the context of American society and in world politics.

6. The hiring of an Asian Christian social worker to research areas of social concern on the West Coast, e.g., in the areas of housing, pre-school and day care, nursing and retirement homes; youth and drug abuse, mental health, etc.

7. A program to bring Asian American laypersons into the church structure to participate as a voice in church policy.

8. The employment of Asian ministers in non-Asian churches.

9. The training of Asians as missionaries in Asia.

10. The training of Japanese American ministers in Japan to later minister to Issei and new immigrants.

11. To attract Asian youth to church ministry.

12. Funding is requested of the American Baptist church to implement the above proposals.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the churches include within the church curriculum aspects of Asian experiences as human relations.

2. That the churches hasten the development of programs to include Asians and minorities within their hierarchy.

3. That the churches be more socially concerned in the areas of community needs and that the church hierarchy aid in the implementing of these activities.

4. That the church hierarchy scrutinize the practices of placement of ministers and rectify any forms of disparate treatment of Asian ministers.

SOCIAL CLUBS

Andres Tangalin

I'm going to speak on the exclusionary social club issue - a very real one for Asian Americans. There are a variety of social clubs. We have those of the animal kingdom - the Elks, the Eagles, the Moose, and we have those that center around academic areas, business clubs, and a variety of other organizations where people can get together and at the same time provide a convenient way for meeting people. The position of rising expectations of minorities in trying to get a share of the action, together with the continuing reality of inacceptability have placed the minority in a very disadvantaged position.

I'd like to read a statement made by one of the Elks' lodges:

> "On the rolls of the various lodges we found the names of America's prominent officials: bankers, merchants, journalists, medical and legal men, together with the brightest lights in our literature and music."[1]

Add the word white before these occupational groupings and the sentence that I read comes into real significance. Social clubs afford an opportunity for people to come together where information is exchanged. If you are an enterprising young Asian and you want to get some information, you would like to find out where it's at. Since you find you are not acceptable, you are placed in a very noncompetetive situation. You are isolated; you are out of the free-flow of the information; and it perpetuates white power. The Elks, Eagles, and Moose say you must be white, male, sound in mind and body. As an Asian when you try to enroll, they will say, "No, this is against our by-laws." In effect, you are of unsound mind, not equal, and something less than a person.

I get very frustrated when I see in their goals and aims the preservation of brotherhood, the fulfillment of occupational expertise, the broad goals of humanity, dedication to service, to one's community. Yet they say that in order for you to do that, you have to be white. Many of their "altruistic" programs include sponsoring events where my children or your children may be on a soccer or bowling team - all in the name of brotherhood; yet the parents of these same youngsters are denied membership because of their race - not because of their worth and self-dignity, but because of their race.

---

[1] Robert W. Mears, "Social Work and Whites-Only Clubs," 1972. Unpublished paper prepared for Puget Sound Chapter of National Association of Social Workers.

Other organizations may not specify racial exclusion but in order to join the club one has to have so much money, and if you don't have it, you can't get in. If you are denied accessibility, either through economic or racial reasons, you are still a steo-child. Social clubs provide one of the most convenient vehicles for people to know what's going on. By not participating in this, you are like a bouncing ball - you just bounce but get nowhere. In the meantime, the system continues to exclude minorities and the dominant members of society remain in decision making, executive positions, and control as merchants of goods, services, and politics.

Our legislators are sworn to uphold the constitution, and agree in principle to refrain any of their members or their constituent groups from patronizing clubs which hold discriminatory clauses. We have many clubs that have overt racial barriers. Yet, when they purchase their liquor in bulk they receive the state's discount of 15%. When you ask legislators why something isn't done about it, the 90% who agree in the principle of non-discrimination, gets trimmed down to about 30% that say each club should have their own method of entering people. If legislators do not legislate against the granting of liquor licenses, the system gets perpetuated. Some people say, "Work from within." Well, if you don't have a chance to get in there is no way you can do that. There are those who are in who find it very frustrating because they cannot bring about the desired change. So the system moves on. If you are denied acceptability, you simply remain outside, separated, and isolated. You are alone, and you remain that way.

CAN YOU GIVE US AN EXAMPLE OF HOW MEMBERSHIPS IN THESE CLUBS EXCLUDE MINORITIES AND UPWARD MOBILITY IN CERTAIN FIRMS?

There was a study done by Reed Powell[1] on a sample of 109 executives. A series of questions asked about the opportunities that were provided by the social club, and the positive responses ranged from 50% to about 87% on these items: "Information relevant to a firm can be obtained; valuable contacts can be made in clubs; clubs are prestigeous places where guests can be taken for informal lunches and associations; it adds to one's status for the firm and/or community when one belongs to a club; it helps to develop friendships which aids promotions; membership in clubs leads to contacts and friendships which leads to a better position in other companies; clubs provide a retreat for members from outside influences and offers an environment for pleasant interesting and stimulating conversation." If you are denied the opportunity to get into the clubs, you're denied that kind of information and contact. When you don't know the influential and prominent decision makers or business deals that may be in the offing, you simply remain out of the economic mainstream.

---

[1] Reed M. Powell, "Race, Religion, and the Promotion of the American Executive," Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1969.

WHAT IS YOUR VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN PERPETUATING DISCRIMINATION IN SOCIAL CLUBS IN REGARD TO THAT 15% LIQUOR DISCOUNT?

It has to be more than executive order.[1] The liquor control board could take a stand and deny liquor license to clubs that overtly use discrimination as a means to limit people in their particular organization.[2] Furthermore, if the liquor control board feels that it cannot make a decision, then it's incumbent upon the legislators to pass a law which will not allow the bulk-rate discount to clubs which are discriminatory on the basis of race.[3]

HOW MUCH REVENUE DOES THE STATE RECEIVE FROM THESE CLUBS IN LIQUOR SALES?

I don't know what the latest figures are.[4]

THIS MAY BE A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF REVENUE. HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS DISCOUNT FOR ECONOMIC SURVIVAL OF SOCIAL CLUBS?

---

[1] Seattle Post Intelligencer news item, November 19, 1971. "Governor Dan Evans will immediately issue an executive order to agencies under his jurisdiction to abstain from use of facilities of discriminatory clubs in the course of official business." He will also "ask the legislature to deny liquor licenses to...organizations which restrict membership on racial, religious, or ethnic grounds."

[2] In spite of the Secretary of State's 1969 recommendation that "the State Liquor Control Board adopt a regulation prohibiting discrimination in the use of State liquor licenses," the Board continues to grant licenses (and discount) to exclusionary clubs.

[3] "The legislature should enact a law declaring that no exclusionary club shall be eligible for Class H liquor license." Policy and Recommendations on Exclusionary Clubs, Washington Human Rights Commission, adopted October 1970, revised November 1971.

[4] Washington State Elks purchased $1,511,167.39 of liquor for resale from the State in 1969. With the membership in that year being 109,409 the purchase on per capita membership basis is $13.81. --from Know This - The Facts, Washington State Elks Association, 1970-71. Kent, Washington.

With a discount you are afforded an opportunity to buy cheap drinks, and therefore can entertain your clients cheaply. It competes with the restaurants who have public accessibility with the impact of raising liquor prices. I would say that many of these clubs would find themselves in dire economic straits without the discount.[1]

ARE THESE CLUBS GIVEN ANY KIND OF TAX-EXEMPTION STATUS?

Yes, they are. I think there have been some movements by states to deny them that tax exemption category, but for Washington State, I'm not sure.

WOULD YOU COMMENT ON THE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS OF THE ELKS?

The Elks have established scholarships which are available to all.[2] Scholarships are awarded to individuals and for those that win them, it's a personal decision to accept or reject them. A black librarian, who was to receive a check from the Ladies Auxiliary for the Lacy library at the Lacey Moose Lodge, was refused admittance.

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF AN ORGANIZATION, SUCH AS THE BOY SCOUTS, WHICH HAVE THE CREDO OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP AS PART OF THEIR CONSTITUTION TO BE SPONSORED BY RACIALLY EXCLUSIVE CLUBS?

That people show by actions rather than by rhetoric. If organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, and the Girl Scouts were really serious about eliminating the subordination of minorities, they would withdraw their support in organizations which discriminate on the basis of race.[3]

---

[1] The economic well-being of practically all of the 283 Class H licensed clubs are enhanced by the State discount on liquor purchases. In a majority of the 122 private clubs from which figures are available, over 50% of their gross sales revenue derive from liquor receipts. In some, liquor is the largest single source of income. --from "Discrimination - Private Clubs and the State Liquor Licenses," 1968. Jay A. Higbee.

[2] In 1969, the Washington Elks spent $65,014 for leadership and scholarship programs. On a per capita Elk membership basis this translates to $0.60/member. --from Know This - The Facts, Washington State Elks Association, 1970-1971. Kent, Washington.

[3] The Boy Scouts of America's official position is that "sponsorship of a unit will not be granted by the BSA to a group that establishes a rule or custom preventing any youth or adult from membership in its unit because of race or ethnic background." Nationally, in 1969, the Elks sponsored 998 scouting units or 0.653% of the total, in the Chief Seattle Council 0.975%, and the Evergreen area council 2.913%

I'VE HEARD THE RESPONSE THAT A PERSON SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE HIS OWN FRIENDS, ALBEIT PRIVATE CLUBS. WHAT WOULD YOUR COMMENT BE TO A RESPONSE OF THAT NATURE?

I think that's functional. A private club has the right to set its membership requirements on the basis of an ethno-cultural function or a function that specifically relates to the membership. An educator's association would be, or presumably deal, with educators, and so forth; but when you deny accessibility on the basis of race, that is a psychological violence. It's a violence that begins to say that because of your physical features, you are less than what we are.

OF SUCH ORGANIZATIONS THAT DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE,[1] WOULD YOU AGREE IT'S OK FOR THEM TO EXIST AS LONG AS THEY DO NOT HAVE SPECIAL FAVORS SUCH AS TAX EXEMPTIONS AND SPECIAL LIQUOR DISCOUNTS?

If race was one of the requirements of a club, then I think they should be denied any type of special privileges that are given by the state.[2]

DO YOU HAVE ANY FIGURES ON THE PERCENTAGE OF LEGISLATORS WHO ARE, IN FACT, MEMBERS OF ORGANIZATIONS?

---

of the units. These figures are in contradiction to the claim by Elks that they "sponsor more Boy Scout units than any other organization," Letter, Colin McLennan, Director of South Snohomish County Council to Lloyd Knutson, Scout Executive, Evergreen Area Council, March 2, 1971.

[1] There are eight national or international organizations with Washington chapters with racial exclusionary policies. These are: Eagles, Elks, Freemasons, Knights of Pythias, Moose, Odd Fellows, Redmen, and United Commercial Travelers. The three largest groups are Elks (105,000), Eagles (55,000), and Moose (12,000). This numerical strength may be quadrupled by family groups and associations and their political strength by virtue of politicians' memberships.

[2] "Discrimination against any person because of race, creed, color or national origin...under any circumstance violates the rights of that person, injures the peace and security of all inhabitants...and is contrary to the public policy...." "Sound public policy must have respect for both freedom of association and freedom from discrimination." "Government should not subsidize exclusionary clubs, economically, should not legitimize them with patronage or official recognition and should not accord them special privileges." --from Policy and Recommendations on Exclusionary Clubs, Washington State Board Against Discrimination.

I do have that figure but I don't think I brought it with me.[1]

DO YOU HAVE ANY FIGURES ON HOW MUCH THE MEMBERS - SAY THE ELKS - WITH A MEMBERSHIP OF 1.4 MILLION NATIONALLY, CONTRIBUTE TO CHARITY BASED ON A BREAKDOWN PER MEMBER?

On a national basis I think it breaks down to about $5/member. In spite of all they say about what they do for charities, when you break it down by club members, it's still pretty small. But a great amount of publicity communicates otherwise to the rest of society.[2]

WHAT CHANCES WOULD YOU GIVE THAT MEMBERS WOULD WORK FROM WITHIN TO GET RID OF THE RACIAL CLAUSES?

Zero.

DO YOU HAVE SOME BASIS FOR THAT?

Look at the record of the last couple of years of the Elks Club as a barometer of changing the national policy regarding race restriction. The vote at the national convention has been something like 1600 to 40 against change, and last year there was a decrease in percentage of people voting for a change. There are some chapters in the nation that are starting to work from within to get these changes but they are subservient to the national. When you get to the national level, you get such a voting discrepancy that there's something like 80 or 90% to retain the white clause. Locals are fairly impotent; and I don't see the national relinquishing control to the local organizations.[3]

DO YOU KNOW OF ANY ORGANIZED GROUP THAT IS ATTEMPTING TO COMBAT THESE EXCLUSIONARY CLUBS?

---

[1] Twenty of Washington State's fifty senators (1973) or 40% have membership in 38 lodges that restrict membership to whites only. 35% of Senators admit to being in one or more of Elks, Eagles or Moose. This is a non-partisan affair (D=11, R=9). Eighteen of the 98 State House of Representatives have 24 memberships in racially exclusive clubs. --Washington Coalition Against Discrimination.

[2] In 1969, the Washington Elks spent $497,742 for youth activities and charitable contributions. On a per capita Elks membership basis, this amounts to $4.55/member, about 1/3 of the amount spent for liquor (Footnote 4, p. 107).

[3] For four consecutive years, the Elks national convention has rejected a resolution to strike the whites-only membership requirement.

In the state of Washington, the Coalition Against Discrimination (CAD)[1] originated a couple years ago spearheaded by Asian Coalition for Equality (ACE). CAD is supported by 40 or more organizations representing 250,000 people. They have introduced legislation, and have been effective by bringing facts of discrimination to government officials and various organizations and agencies. CAD has also introduced legislation and lobbied. They've been hard at work trying to create an awareness at the local and state governments about the need to eliminate special privileges for the clubs that discriminate on the basis of race. There are some other groups in different parts of the state that are also raising the issue. A newspaper called Urban World goes to fifth and sixth graders in school, and they had a whole issue on discriminatory clubs for students to read and discuss. It also mentioned a number of people in Illinois and Wisconsin that are waging one-man battles to get the social clubs to change their membership requirements. It's going to take more than one organization, more than one person to fight this battle. But, right now, it is carried out by very few people and some very dedicated organizations.

YOU HAVE MENTIONED THAT THERE ARE MANY MEMBERS OF OUR LEGISLATURE THAT ARE MEMBERS OF RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY CLUBS. DO YOU SEE THEIR BELONGING AS AFFECTING THEIR ABILITY TO DEAL EFFECTIVELY WITH THE WIDE-RANGE OF MINORITY PROBLEMS?

That would be like a judge belonging to a racially exclusive club and sitting in judgment of minorities. The same applies to legislators who pass on laws to serve the people who are their constituencies. It would seem to me that they would want to drop their membership in these organizations, but when they support them, I think the fact is clear that they simply won't act on any kind of legislation which would harm the organizations to which they belong.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That action be taken by the State through the State Liquor Board or the State Legislature to deny Class H. licenses to racially discriminatory social clubs.

2. That no governmental assistance or recognition of any nature be accorded organizations or members of organizations that have discriminatory clauses. For example,

    a. That no governmental function take place in these social clubs.

---

[1] Washington State Coalition Against Discrimination, 220 Plaza 600 Building, Seattle, Washington 98101. - Colin McLennan, Director.

b. That State legislators and officials pledge not to patronize, accord special privileges to, or give official recognition to these organizations.

c. That no appointments to State boards and commissions be made of members of these organizations.

d. That persons holding membership in these organizations not receive any funds from any publicly tax-based group, nor be allowed to hold any publicly held position when decisions may affect minorities.

3. That judges who belong to these organizations be disqualified from every case involving non-whites.

4. Finally, inasmuch as discriminatory social clubs have long received State benefits such as liquor discounts, political access through wining/dining capabilities, etc., and inasmuch as such clubs profess to be promoting brotherhood and service to the community while blatantly excluding non-whites, it would seem that they would be glad to pay their benevolent dues.

Therefore, it is recommended that the State institute a special liquor retribution tax on all liquor purchased by such clubs, and that such revenues be applied to programs for the achievement of racial equality.

SUMMARY

The present extends its tap roots deep into the past and is nourished by elements therein. Who we are and where we stand reflect our nature and our experiences. The past history of prejudice and discrimination against Asians have left an inner scar, slow and difficult to heal, just as white majority society perpetuates racism unable to perceive the high cost of this dehumanization.

The hateful passions of World War II, the Korean conflict, and the Indochina fiasco have steadily transfused increments of contempt and denigration for the enemy with a blurred Asian face. From "Japs" to "Gooks" is an easy all-encompassing transition. White America cannot seem to distinguish the Asiatic from the Asian American. Thus, the latter is inexorably entangled in a web of economic, political, and social complexities and conflicts.

> Alarm at the rising industrial prowess of Japan has aroused anew the spector of a "yellow peril" which makes Japanese Americans more vulnerable. In 1967, when Japan-American relations were even more positive than now in 1973, 48% of Californians polled said they felt that the mass evacuation and detention of people of Japanese ancestry in 1942 was justified.
>
> J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, in 1971, testified at a House Appropriations Committee with the warning that 300,000 of Chinese ancestry here in the United States were possible subversives.
>
> A midwestern Congressman, in 1972, was to admonish a third-generation Japanese American, "Are you willing to guarantee to us that your country will never bomb Pearl Harbor again?"
>
> A flood of hate calls and letters, recalling Pearl Harbor, were received in Seattle after a T.V. documentary on the mass incarceration of Japanese in 1942 and similarly in California at the opening of a photographic exhibit depicting the evacuation.
>
> A syndicated columnist, assessing public opinion on the Viet Nam war, was to say, "High praise for Harry Truman began to pepper my notes. What people liked, it turned out, was that 'He had the courage to drop the big bomb on those Orientals.'"

The younger generation no longer adheres to the passive stereotype; the rise of Third World and Yellow Power attest to the Asian American movement. The emergence of yellow power is tied to ethnic identity and the inner need for fulfillment. The movement has spread from campuses to community and into the lives of Asians of all ages, and voices raised - heretofore not raised - press for equality and justice. The stereotype of the Asian American conjured up by American society as a model minority has become translated into a forgotten minority whose problems are ignored. The voices heard in testimonies and recorded here attest to the fallacy of that stereotype. The testimonies describe far-reaching tentacles of discrimination, permeating all aspects of our society - economic, educational, social, and psychological.

Asians are systematically denied entry into many different areas of employment and prevented from gaining upward mobility in their jobs and job training. Some of the major employment fields, this report touches on, include the health professions, postal system, news media, construction and contracting, fire fighters, and educational institutions. The record, reflecting conditions of unemployment and under-employment which plague the Asian American community, is damning and extensive.

In the realm of education, textbooks, visual aids, curriculum, and teachers - all bear the stamp of prejudice, and educators maintain an inability to recognize the uniqueness of Asians, to acknowledge the history and contribution of Asians, and to establish and develop programs and classes to meet the needs of Asians. The additional problem of inequitable tests and admissions criteria, and the lack of sufficient aid and supportive services exact their toll on the Asian American student in particular and on the entire student population in general.

Discrimination is an ugly element in American society's social institutions. The exclusionary clubs provide the locale for business and social contacts, and because of their racist policies, place the Asians in a clearly disadvantageous position. The church, in espousing principles of love and peoplehood, is not mindful of its hypocritical practices and actions concerning Asians. The public welfare system treats Asians with little sensitivity to their unique needs and cultural background, and simultaneously seems to minimize even those services available to them.

It is, perhaps, one last aspect which is the most insidious - the psychological effects of discrimination, the demeaning of a people, a denial of their dignity, and a disregard of respect which is their due. The manifestations of this superiorist attitude may be a certain look, a gesture, a tone of voice; at other times, a loss of a job or potential promotion, an outright verbal insult. This attitude may manifest itself in remarks implying that Asian women are prostitutes, that Asian Americans are just like the "enemy," or in assigning the role of "house mouse" to Asians. Most of these slurs cannot be completely documented in the traditional sense because they involve responses and emotions which originate from deep in the inner person. Discriminatory experiences are most real to those who actually experience them.

The perpetuation of existing discrimination is a vicious circle based on self-validation. When groups discriminated against are kept suppressed by institutional racism, the target person finds less job opportunity and promotion; is kept at lower status and earns less; lives in a less desirable area; his children go to schools that offer less; his social environment may be more conducive to socially deviant behavior; and his life style may be different from the majority group. Superimposed on this is the inner stigma which attaches to the assigned badge of inferiority, a negative self image and a resignation to a lower status. The targeted individual's self-perception and the majority society's perception, then, are self-fulfilling prophecies which help to falsely validate the majority's discriminatory acts as appropriate for an inferior.

Prejudice is a prejudgment of others based on mental images and stereotypic views. Discrimination as an act, thus, can be behavior consequent to this bias. The belief and act are not one and the same, even though one may lead to or reinforce the other. There is often a disparity between what one thinks and what one does. While prejudice may be deep rooted, it can be modified, but only in the context of associations based on equality. In the shorter term, the fight must be for the elimination of discriminatory acts against Asians with the longer term hope that on this achievement prejudice will wither and fall by the wayside.

Political and economic realities can force peoples and institutions to desist from discriminatory acts. The present drive to eliminate racially exclusionary membership clauses in social clubs was highlighted recently by a Supreme Court ruling upholding the decision of the Maine Liquor Board to deny liquor licenses to these clubs. The Moose Lodge, at their national convention in May, 1973, voted to eliminate the racial membership clause, while the Grand Exalted Ruler of the Elks is now advocating dropping the "whites only" clause, even as he decries this threat to their financial security. It is a sad commentary that these are right moves but for the wrong reason of economic survival rather than the professed brotherhood of man.

The challenge to change focuses on a direct attack on discrimination as the most promising course of action. This report does not attempt to represent itself as the ultimate solution to these long-existing problems, but it presents some specific recommendations for subsequent action. The recommendations, found at the end of each section of testimony, are too numerous to recapitulate. The bulk of action has been requested, demanded, of government agencies and officials invested with certain specific authorities. The recommendations are equitable and desirable and fall within their power and mandate. They are responsible for action on these recommendations, for the rectification of the racial discrimination.

In the final analysis, to overcome prejudice, change must come from within individuals, with individual confrontation and cooperation, and with individual interaction. A combination of political action and personal interchange is the means to the eradication of prejudice and discrimination, one approach not excluding the other. It is a time for creative dissension and a time for constructive action. Rhetoric may fall on deaf ears and people move in accordance to pressures and emotions. The challenge is here and now; we must move with increasing vigor if the ideals of democracy and equality of peoples are to be achieved. Asian Americans and American society cannot afford to fail in this endeavor.

> Brothers, Sisters,
> understand this:
>
> You are in passage---
> wherever you go
>
> you are slanted
> down to the bone.
>
> Do your eyes lie?
>
> Brothers, Sisters
> understand this:
>
> you are beautiful
>
> and your dancing grandmother
> is dancing in your eyes,
>
> Cooing and cooing you
> home to roost.
>
> ---Lawson Inada*

---

* from 'Asian Brothers, Asian Sisters' in Roots: An Asian American Reader, Eds. A. Tashiki, E. Wong, F. Odo, B. Wong. UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1971.